

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 5, 1992

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Faouzi Elia, pastor, St. Sharbel Maronite Catholic Church, Peoria, IL, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, it was Your divine will to grant the civic leaders of the United States of America, the merciful and generous mother to all nations, the power to lead with honesty and respect, the wisdom to teach with love, the knowledge to advise with sincerity, the authority to govern with justice, the wealth to give with generosity, the talents to share with self-denial, the humility to serve with a Christian spirit, the love to make peace in every nation.

May our leaders bring justice and hope to the homeless, to the needy, to the persecuted, and to the refugees.

I pray to God to bless this great country and the people of this country, to bless the Members of this Congress, their families and friends.

May this loving country, the leader of the free world, continue to bring peace to all nations, especially to my homeland, Lebanon. May the suffering people of Lebanon, under Your protection and guidance, continue to enjoy their independence, freedom, sovereignty, and integrity. May God, through Your power, wisdom, and decisions, save my homeland, Lebanon, from any destruction or invasion. May the people of that country never see again war, nor persecution, nor famine, nor occupation, nor poverty.

May this great Nation, under one God, always be a beacon of freedom, justice, and liberty to the people of all nations.

May God bless you and bless our beloved country, America. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FATHER FAOUZI ELIA

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our prayer today was offered by a distinguished member of my home community, Father Faouzi Elia, pastor of St. Sharbel's Church in Peoria, and I want the Members to know just a little bit about him.

Father Elia was born in Lebanon. He finished college studies in his native country and in 1970 entered the Pontifical Institute of the University of the Vatican. He completed his theological studies in Rome in 1976.

During that time he worked as an interpreter at the Vatican in French, Italian, and Arabic. He has a B.S. degree in philosophy from Our Lady of Lebanon College, and a license in theology from the Pontifical Institute.

He was ordained in Chicago, IL, and before coming to my home community served in Houston, TX.

Father Elia is not only a spiritual leader but is actually involved in community affairs. Since he has come to our home town he has inspired leadership and inspiration in the building of a community hall, a church building, and the St. Sharbel Apartments for the Elderly.

He is an expert on Middle Eastern affairs, to whom I turn for advice and guidance on many issues.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure then for me to welcome a very revered religious leader and community leader, and as I would have to say, more importantly for me personally, a dear personal friend, to have him open our session with a prayer and to welcome him to this House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that it will limit 1-minute statements to an additional eight on each side.

JUDGE EDWARD DEVITT: DISTINGUISHED ST. PAUL JURIST

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues of the death of U.S. District Court Judge and former Member of Congress, Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota.

Judge Devitt died this past Monday, March 2, at the age of 80. He was his ac-

tive, gregarious self, the spirited Irish-American personality, much loved, and a good friend to all. He especially will be remembered March 17, 1992, St. Patrick's Day. Judge Devitt's distinguished career of public service spanned over 57 years, from his election at age 24 as a municipal judge in East Grand Forks, MN, his appointment as an assistant Minnesota attorney general, his service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, his election to the U.S. House of Representatives from Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, and finally his service on the Federal bench in Minnesota from 1954 to 1981. During the past decade, Judge Devitt continued to serve as a very active senior status Federal judge.

Judge Devitt was aptly described by his colleague on the Federal bench, Judge Donald Alsop, as "a giant among Federal judges." When he was appointed to the Federal bench by President Eisenhower in 1954, he was, at age 43, one of the youngest Federal judges in the Nation. He was known as a tough, pragmatic but fairminded judge. The cases over which he presided involved football players, massive insurance fraud, kidnappings, the so-called Minnesota 8 draft protesters, career criminals, and just last year, the trial of Walter Leroy Moody, Jr., who was convicted of using pipe bombs to murder a Federal judge in Alabama and a civil rights attorney in Georgia.

Edward J. Devitt was born on May 5, 1911, in the Dayton's Bluff neighborhood of St. Paul. He attended Van Buren Grade School with two other boys who later went on to distinguished careers in the law; Warren Burger, who became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Harry Blackmun, who became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Judge Devitt graduated from St. John's University in Collegeville, MN, and the University of North Dakota Law School.

In addition to his duties as a Federal judge, Edward Devitt was concerned throughout his career with improving the administration of justice in the Federal court system. He chaired a committee of the American Bar Association that developed fair trial and free press guidelines after observing that the Supreme Court had reversed several criminal convictions because defendants' rights to fair trials had been tainted. Judge Devitt also expressed his concerns about determinate sentencing by noting that he thought the Federal system was too rigid while the State court systems were too loose.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

In recognition of his leadership role in the Federal judiciary, the Devitt Award was created and is presented annually to the Federal judge who is selected as the foremost judge in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Devitt also served one term, from 1946 to 1948, as a Member of the House of Representatives from St. Paul. His tenure in elective politics, however, was a brief interlude in a career that was devoted to the practice of law and the judiciary. I know that my fellow Minnesotans would join me in extending our sympathy to his family on his passing, as well as our appreciation for his lifetime dedication to public service for the people of Minnesota and the Nation.

DEMOCRATS SHOW TRUE COLORS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, you don't need to look too far beneath the surface of Democratic rhetoric about tax fairness and concern for the middle class to see their true colors. Last week the Democrats passed yet another huge tax increase.

Their solution in the Democrat tax increase bill: a temporary, 2-year tax credit. Apparently, the evils of a decade of voodoo economics can be reversed in a mere 2 years. Further, the credit is capped at \$200 for individuals and \$400 for couples. The American people are outraged at the suggestion that at a mere 55 cents a day is presented as a legitimate solution to the woes of the average taxpayer. Yet, the deceptive tactics of the majority do not stop at this insult.

While the Democratically proposed tax credit may be temporary, their means of financing are quite the opposite. In exchange for giving the middle class a mere glimpse at tax relief, the Democrats would permanently increase the top income rate from 31 to 35 percent, increase the alternative minimum tax from 24 to 25 percent, impose a 10-percent surtax on millionaires, extend the phaseout of the personal exemption and itemized deductions, and prohibit businesses from deducting executive salaries over \$1 million. Not only do the American people find the Democratic proposal ridiculous, they can also see first hand how nonsensical their thinking is. For instance, if the Democrats are successful in preventing businesses from paying their executives over \$1 million, who will be subject to the millionaire surtax?

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have shown their true colors, and as usual, the concern they express for the middle class is only rhetoric. Congress has only 15 days before the March 20 deadline. The American people want action now.

IT IS THE 1990'S: IT IS THE DEMOCRATS

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last night in this Chamber the President of the United States had his budget presented to the American people and to the Members of Congress. That budget, which he had sent to us a month ago touting his plan for the future of this country, got 42 votes out of 435. Even the members of his own party could not bring themselves, by a margin of 1 in 4, to vote for this budget.

That budget last night, that met the fate it deserved, was a cruel hoax on the American people, perpetuating the bad policy of 12 years of Reagan-Bush economics.

The Democratic budget alternative, which will be on the floor today, which will be voted on today and we hope passed, is the future for this country, creating jobs, creating economic growth, and restoring sanity in the understanding of what this country needs to strive for.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the President's budget shows obviously he has exhausted his ideas and it is time for the Democrats. It is the 1990's. It is the Democrats.

□ 1010

GIVE THE GOVERNMENT BACK TO THE PEOPLE

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America was founded on the premise that its people have the freedom and the ability to control their own destiny. Today, our huge bureaucracy has infringed on this concept. The left has seemingly failed to understand that the combination of increasingly higher taxes and an exploding budget has made it harder for every American to enjoy those freedoms which are supposed to be self-evident. The Democrats in Congress passed yet another huge tax increase bill last week.

Let us give the Government back to the people. It's time to stop running a Government that is influenced by a select few in the think tanks of the liberal elite and instead answer to the people. We need a Government that will provide economic growth while protecting their right to the pursuit of happiness. We, the Government in behalf of the people, have 15 days to do just that. This package will give the American people what they want. By cutting wasteful spending and, most important of all, by cutting taxes we can give the people back their Govern-

ment as well as their personnel freedoms. Let us work together to pass a jobs creation package and show Americans, and the world, that democracy works.

Mr. Speaker, there are only 15 days left until the March 20 deadline for Congress to finally act on a real growth package.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON VIOLENCE

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a House Resolution which will establish a Select Committee on Violence. All indicators suggest, without equivocation, that violence in the United States has reached epidemic proportions. It is an issue which affects all Americans and permeates every aspect of American life, affecting our families, schools, hospitals, prisons, courtrooms, and churches like no other issue. The time has come for Congress to provide expanded leadership in addressing this crisis.

Just a few weeks ago, funeral services were held here in the Capitol for a 25-year-old Hill staffer, Tom Barnes, who was shot in the head near his Capitol Hill home. The young man had left his home to go get a cup of coffee at a nearby grocery store. He never made it. Initial reports indicated that the shooting was an act of random violence. More recent reports furnished by the police state that he was the victim of a hold-up attempt. No matter what the precipitating factor, most agree that the death of this young man, who was a legislative assistant to Senator RICHARD SHELBY, was both senseless and untimely.

In one sense, his death serves as a reminder of the violence, the assaults, rapes, and homicides taking place right here on Capitol Hill. In a broader sense, it is a reflection of the type of violence that is tearing this country apart. Like those who mourn the loss of Tom Barnes, thousands of parents, siblings, and others across the Nation are attempting to come to grips with the insanity of violence as they mourn the untimely violent deaths of their loved ones.

Listen for a moment to these dramatic statistics. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that violent crime—murder, rape, robbery, and assault—increased by 10 percent in the United States last year, setting the record for the bloodiest year in our Nation's history. The record murder toll of 1990 left more than 23,200 Americans

killed. Records also were set for rape, robbery, and assault. All told, an unprecedented total of nearly 2 million Americans were the victims of a violent crime last year. This total means that more than 200 Americans were attacked by a violent criminal in every hour of every day of 1990. Compare this to 1960, when fewer than 35 Americans were victimized every hour.

Within the last 30 years, between 1960 and 1990, the Senate Judiciary Committee reports that violent crime increased 12 times faster than the population. During this period, the population grew by about 41 percent, while the violent crime total increased by about 516 percent. Murder grew nearly 4 times, rape more than 12 times, and assault grew 13 times faster than the rate of population growth.

The increase in violent crime in this country has set a world record. We are the most violent and self-destructive nation on Earth.

As indicated previously, during 1990, no nation had a higher rate of rape than this country. Last year, American women were times more likely to be raped than European women. In 1990, the incidence of rape was 20 times higher than it was in Portugal; 26 times higher than in Japan; 15 times higher than in England; 8 times higher than in France, 23 times higher than in Italy, and 46 times higher than in Greece.

In terms of robbery, the difference in its occurrence here in this Nation, as opposed to other countries is absolutely staggering. In 1990, the United States robbery rate was nearly 150 times higher than in Japan, 47 times higher than in Ireland, and over 100 times higher than in Greece.

Furthermore, in 1990, no nation had a higher murder rate than ours. In fact, no other nation was even close. Americans are dying from unnecessary violent death in unprecedented numbers. The U.S. murder rate quadrupled Europe's. Consider, for example, last year, murders in this country were more than double the murder rate in Northern Ireland, which is being ravaged by a civil war. More specifically, in 1990, homicide in the United States was 11 times that of Japan, nearly 9 times that of England, over 4 times that of Italy, and 9 times that of Egypt and Greece.

In reference to the issue of homicide, I would like to share with you an observation made by Dr. Onwuachi-Saunders, of the Centers for Disease Control. During the Congressional Black Caucus health braintrust last September, a forum which I chair annually on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, she said:

In the last year, the Nation mobilized and went to war. Less than 200 Americans died on battlefields in the Middle East. During the same time period, over 24,000 Americans died as a result of homicide or interpersonal violence on American soil. Although we have won the war abroad, we are losing the battle at home.

In this country, daily, we hear accounts of innocent children wounded in drive-by shootings, schools overrun by gangs with weapons, and other atrocities destroying human life. Just a couple of months ago, right here in Washington, I read of a 15-year-old teenager who was arrested for fatally shooting a volunteer firefighter because he did not like the music the victim was playing in his car. The week prior to that shooting, another teenager was arrested for fatally shooting a young woman while she was riding as a passenger in a car. Police reports suggest that the youth shot the woman, "because he felt like killing somebody."

In terms of those precipitating factors leading to assault or murder, I remember a few years ago when I struggled to understand how a youth could kill someone over tennis shoes, a leather coat, a look. Today, I am absolutely confounded by the fact that many times, heinous, coldblooded acts of violence are occurring for no apparent reasons at all.

Data compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveals that teens are bearing the brunt of the Nation's murder epidemic. The murder rate among young adults is rising more than five times faster than for the population in general. In fact, between 1985 and 1990, the risk of murder among 15- to 19-year-olds rose by 103 percent. For the total population it rose by only 19 percent.

Overall, the homicide rate for all males ages 15 to 34 in the United States ranges from 17 to 283 times higher than the rate for young males in other industrialized countries. For young African-American and Hispanic males, the disproportionate rate of violence-related deaths is even more pronounced. According to the Centers for Disease Control, for young African-American males between the ages of 15 to 32, homicide is the leading cause of death. In fact, it accounts for 42 percent of all African-American male deaths. For young African-American females, the CDC reports that, homicides accounted for 26 percent of all deaths. Homicide is the leading cause of death for both African-American males and females 15 to 25 years of age.

Contrast these statistics with the fact that nationally African-Americans accounted for 44 percent of all murder victims, but only comprise 12 percent of the population.

In the Hispanic community, young males between the ages of 16 and 30 also are disproportionately affected. Out of this group, Puerto Rican males have the highest incidence, and one of the highest rates in the Nation, with 114.2 deaths per 100,000.

We do not have to look to the Nation's Capital for documentation of senseless death by homicide. In Cleveland, OH, a city that I represent in Congress, and throughout the State of

Ohio, there are plenty of stories which can be told. On November 21, the news show "48 Hours" reported on violence in several cities across the Nation—Miami, San Francisco, and Cleveland. A local advocate for violence prevention, Mike Walker, was interviewed as part of that exposé. During his interview, he noted that parts of Cleveland "are as bad as the Middle East and South America."

In the United States, Ohio ranks as one of the top seven States hit by the greatest increases in murder; 730 murders are estimated for 1991, representing a 10-percent increase over 1990's number of 663.

Moreover, I think it is important to note that in the State of Ohio, the county in which Cleveland sits, Cuyahoga County, from 1979 to 1987, had the highest rate of homicides in the State per 100,000 population, with 15.3 percent of all deaths classified as homicides. Another 13.7 percent of all deaths in Cuyahoga County were classified as suicide. Of the 221 homicides which occurred in Cuyahoga County during 1990, the coroner reports that 73 percent of these deaths were nonwhite.

At least one national expert, James Alan Fox from Northeastern University, reports that:

The increase in violence that we are beginning to witness and should continue to see for a number of years to come is a consequence of what I call the "baby boomerang effect." Simply, the post-World War II baby boomers grew up and had children, and their children will be entering their teens during the 1990's. This Nation should prepare itself for increasing problems of teen crime, teen pregnancy, and youth unemployment, many of which subsided during the 1980's when the adolescent population was shrinking.

When we look at data compiled between 1960 and 1990, it is clear that a boom in the teenage population contributes to record numbers of teen killers and teen victims. Violent crime, however, is not the result of demographics alone. The availability of deadly drugs and deadly weapons, poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, and broken homes, help to heighten our young people's propensity toward peril. The situation will worsen unless we take decisive action now.

Over the years, I have been a strong supporter of crime control measures. On one occasion, I accompanied a street patrol operation in the King-Kennedy Housing project in Cleveland. I witnessed first hand the effects that drugs and violence have had on neighborhoods throughout America.

The need for expansion of law enforcement activities in communities across the country is apparent. As noted by the Senate Judiciary Committee in its March 1991 report, "Fighting Crime in America: An Agenda for the 1990's," the flow of military-style as-

sault weapons onto our Nation's streets means that all too often the superior firepower belongs to criminals, not law enforcement. Not only is law enforcement being outgunned by criminals, but they are also outnumbered. This report notes that:

In 1950, the Nation had more than three sworn police officers for every one violent crime. But in 1990, the Nation had fewer than one sworn police officer for every three violent crimes.

Not only is the occurrence of violence a criminal issue, because of the injuries and death associated with violence, it is now considered to be one of our Nation's leading health problems. Therefore, in order to win the war on crime, we also must look at innovative treatment and prevention strategies. We ultimately must deal with the underlying rage which fuels the violence plaguing our Nation. Then, and only then can we effectively address the behavior and its outcome. Something more than the detention and execution of youth is needed if we are to attack this epidemic.

It is for this reason that I am introducing this legislation to create a Select Committee on Violence. It is time that Congress exhibited the leadership and commitment needed to develop comprehensive prevention strategies. So far, we have taken an approach to this issue which focuses more on punishment than on prevention.

Consider, for example, that for fiscal year 1992, almost \$10 billion was appropriated for the Department of Justice, which oversees our Nation's law enforcement activities, including the Bureau of Prisons, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Conversely, for those national health programs with a specific focus on violence, preliminary data provided by the Office of Minority Health [OMH] indicates that all of the public health service agencies, with a current budget totaling more than \$16.5 billion, funded approximately 19 projects that addressed homicide, suicide, and unintentional injury during fiscal years 1989 and 1990. Data compiled by OMH indicates that approximately \$4 million was awarded during this period. Of this amount, an estimated \$1.8 million was targeted to minorities.

Within the last year, I have attempted to address this issue as a member of the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee. I authored language as a part of the report accompanying the fiscal year 1992 appropriations measure which directed the Centers for Disease Control to develop, implement, and evaluate community-based programs designed to reduce the incidence and health consequences of youth violence in minority and low-income communities. The language also recommends that CDC support violence prevention activities targeting incarcerated youth.

It is my understanding that this is the first-time that the Department of Health and Human Services has received this type of direction from Congress regarding the funding of the agency's violence reduction and prevention activities.

Also, in December, in coordination with Federal and State agencies, I sponsored a national symposium in Cleveland titled, "From Analysis to Action: Youth Violence Prevention in the State of Ohio." Experts from across the Nation were teamed up with State and local officials to develop strategies focused on the implementation of a State-wide plan on the prevention of violence among African-American and Hispanic youth. Issues addressed included victimization, ethnic variations, political responses, gang violence, and the role of the criminal justice system.

Because of what I have learned as a result of these initial efforts, and as evidenced by recent accounts of violence across this Nation—in the suburbs, rural areas, as well as in the inner-cities—it is clear that much more needs to be done.

Specifically, under the House resolution I am introducing today, Congress would establish a Select Committee, which shall have authority to: First, conduct a continuing oversight and review of the problems associated with all types of violence; second, to study the use of all practical means and methods of encouraging the development of public and private programs and policies directed toward violence prevention and treatment strategies; third, to develop policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to reduce homicides, assaults, and suicides, particularly in those areas where certain groups are disproportionately affected by violence.

In drafting this measure, there are several individuals and organizations which have allowed me to draw upon their expertise, and who have helped to give this issue the attention it deserves. I would like to briefly mention these individuals and organizations: the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, the Office of Minority Health for the Department of Health and Human Services, the Ohio Commission on Minority Health, the Morehouse School of Medicine, and many others including, but not limited to, Dr. Rueben Warren, Dr. Mark Rosenberg, Dr. Chukwudi Onwuachi-Saunders, Dr. Carl Bell, Dr. Beverly Coleman Miller, Dr. Deborah Prothrow-Stith, Dr. Boyd James, Ms. Brenda Muhammed, Ms. Lydia Watts, Dr. Pedro Noguera, and the Honorable Jerome Hornblass.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is familiar in some way with the violence that is plaguing our communities. Moreover, many of us know someone who has been the victim, and

in some instances a perpetrator, of a violent attack. It is clear that incarceration of offenders, and the bandaging and burial of victims are ineffective antidotes for this epidemic.

In closing, I would like to share with you an excerpt taken from Deborah Prothrow-Stith's book, "Deadly Consequences." Dr. Prothrow-Stith is a nationally recognized expert on violence prevention and is an assistant dean at the Harvard School of Public Health. In her book, she quotes a woman whose two sons were shot in the same incident. One died, and one did not. The woman is quoted as saying:

The children who are dying are real kids * * * they are real kids, from real families. Some were doing foolish things, and some were just caught in the wrong place at the wrong time. But all kids have a right to make mistakes. All kids have the right to live. Somebody has to wake up and see that our children are dying. My child is dead. Your child could be next.

As Dr. Prothrow-Stith notes, it is time we paid attention to these frightening words. Our courts, jails, emergency rooms, school rooms, and family assistance programs are all feeling the pressure of this swelling epidemic. The very future of our Nation depends on how we address the issue of violence. In its simplest, and most complex, terms it truly is a matter of life and death.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in the cosponsorship and ultimate passage of this legislation.

FULL DISCLOSURE ON HOUSE BANK SCANDAL

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern about what is about to happen to this institution. Recent press reports indicate that over 300 Members of Congress were involved in bouncing checks in this House bank that we used to have. Recent press reports indicate over 100 Members have bounced over \$100,000 worth of checks, and yet the reports in the last few days indicate that the Ethics Committee that is investigating this may release only the names of 25 people.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to resolve all of this controversy, and that is to release all of the names of those people who were involved, and to release to each of those Members their account history in the House bank. Anything short of full disclosure will not end this controversy. Anything short of full disclosure will not convince the American people that we are willing to level with them, and all of this will only serve to fuel the wave of voter resentment against this institution.

MAIL ORDER BANKRUPTCY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, America has another mail order phenomenon. For \$19.95 you can buy your own, do-it-yourself bankruptcy kit. That is right, for \$19.95 you can go belly up all on your own from chapters 13 to 11 right down to chapter 7.

Maybe the reason for that is Congress keeps passing budgets that force people to go bankrupt. What do we really do about foreign aid, what do we do about the defense of these other nations while we are bankrupt, folks? Basically, nothing. Congress cannot make the tough decisions.

Let us tell it like it is. In fact, this budget this year is not a blueprint for America's future, it is an ongoing eulogy, a continuing obituary of America's decline.

Congress had better wise up and make the tough decisions, and this Black Congressional Caucus budget is about the only one that makes some sense as far as NATO is concerned.

FULL DISCLOSURE ON RUBBERGATE

(Mr. NUSSLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, it was about 5 months ago that a group of us asked for full disclosure on what has become known as Rubbergate, or the check kiting scheme that was happening in the House of Representatives. It was discovered that 8,331 checks were bounced by Members of Congress for a period of 1 year, and now, 5 months later, we will finally have the opportunity to let the truth be known.

Or will we? Is full disclosure still the sane answer? The people back in Iowa believe so, Mr. Speaker. The people across this country who write to me and say, "Jim, get out there and fight for us, fight for full disclosure," they think it is the right thing to do.

This is the people's House, Mr. Speaker. That is what I was told when I came here and raised my right hand and took an oath. They told me this was the people's House.

Then let the people decide. This is the House where that has to happen. This is the only place where we can police ourselves. Or can we? That is the issue that we will be addressing this next week.

The Ethics Committee has done their work. They are now ready to release their report. But after that report is released, we all need time to take a look at it and decide what track we are going to take. Are we going to police ourselves, Mr. Speaker, or are the people of this country going to believe that we covered this matter up?

Mr. Speaker, let the people decide. Full disclosure on this matter.

EDUCATION IS A PRIORITY FOR ALL OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. STALLINGS asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a school teacher and college instructor, my commitment to quality in our classrooms is unshakable. Education—from preschool to college—is not just a privilege for the few; it is a priority for all of our children.

If we are to give our kids the needed edge in today's global economy, our commitment to education must be second to none in this year's budget.

Around us a vastly different world is taking shape—the cold war was ended, new economic powers are rising, and nations' borders are being redrawn to reflect these changes. And so this year, we have an historic opportunity to re-evaluate our priorities in light of this new world.

I say plainly: We cannot afford to shortchange education. Funding for educational opportunities, like Headstart, must be a priority.

The key to preparing our children for tomorrow is to provide them with the tools they need to learn today. That is why Headstart is important to so many of our children.

Headstart gives 4-year-olds a chance to learn—by getting them ready to learn. It's a proven success.

But in Idaho, my home State, children in almost half of our counties do not have access to Headstart programs. We must do better.

Our current funding for Headstart is helping a few while so many others are ignored. It is not enough for President Bush to say we're going to fully fund Headstart. We must get every eligible child involved. We must broaden the scope to include 3- and 5-year-olds. We must continue to strengthen the program.

Headstart is but one of the ways to restore quality to our schools. It gives us children eager to learn. But what good are eager children if our classrooms are substandard?

That is why we must follow through with our commitment to Impact Aid for local school districts.

As a public lands State, Idaho has a unique partnership with the Federal Government. In our State, many school districts depend on the Federal Government to compensate them for the impact of this Federal land on their budget.

However, this year the President wants to ignore more than 12,000 schoolchildren in Idaho. By breaking his promise to these local schools, the President would cost Idaho school districts nearly \$1.5 million.

This is a promise we can't afford to break.

I have long been a supporter of Impact Aid for Idaho schools. The funding goes where the folks at home need it. We cannot afford to cut our kids off when their education is on the line.

In Idaho, boys and girls are taught to spend their money wisely and to keep future needs in mind. Today I rise to ask the Congress to do the same. Education is a good buy today and an important investment in tomorrow.

URGING PRESIDENT BUSH TO RECOGNIZE NEW NATIONS OF CROATIA AND SLOVENIA

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the President to recognize the new nations of Croatia and Slovenia. The people of these countries have voted for freedom and democracy in honest elections. The new governments have agreed to the standards on democracy and human rights that the President and Secretary Baker put forward as criteria for recognition. They have proven they will be responsible members of the international community.

This policy of nonrecognition is not only wrong, it hurts our international competitiveness. The European Community has lifted its trade sanctions on the two countries. Their investors now have the opportunity to enter these new markets. The United States is missing a golden opportunity for new export markets. The Slovenian-American and Croatian-American communities would give America a solid advantage in competing with the Europeans and Japanese for this market as the new nations establish capitalist economies. The Serbian-American community could help free Serbia from its Communist shackles once peace comes to the region. We cannot afford to throw away this opportunity.

As long as different ethnic groups are forced to stay together in artificial states, there will be violence as they concentrate on their grievances against each other rather than on how they can cooperate. Croatia and Slovenia are independent countries—45 other nations have recognized them, and I urge the President to extend diplomatic recognition to Croatia and Slovenia.

□ 1020

AN AMERICAN CAMERA

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, the President claims to be the person that

will create jobs for Americans and make this country No. 1 again. But he has been slow to use the authority of his position to preserve, protect, and create these jobs. And the citizens of the United States don't want to wait another 10 months until January and certainly can't wait another 4 years to be able to work.

Congress has an obligation to act now, and I am proposing that we create a program that I call centers for advancing manufacturing and education in rebuilding America [CAMERA].

Mr. Speaker, the CAMERA Program will create centers for excellence around the country that will retrain our workers, educate business people in becoming and remaining competitive, and identifying and supporting innovative technology that will maintain America's manufacturing base.

All of this will be done in partnership with our university system, creating access to education programs that will help our workers not only to stay employed, but to grow and prosper. American industry will be able to remain the indisputable world leader in output and productivity.

Mr. Speaker, the CAMERA Program is a snapshot of America's future, and I invite my colleagues to begin creating such a program now.

CONGRESS URGED TO PASS ECONOMIC GROWTH PACKAGE BY MARCH 20 DEADLINE

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. When asked in a recent poll; who do you blame for the economic woes of the country, they overwhelmingly pointed the finger at Congress.

Once again it shows they are looking for Congress to put aside partisan differences and place the American people first. The country deserves at least this much. But House Democrats are not paying any attention. Last week, they passed a huge tax increase, the second tax increase in 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time and a place for partisanship, now is neither. It is time we put the person on the unemployment line, the couple looking to buy that first home or car or the elderly widow who is afraid to sell that piece of property for fear she will be eaten up by an unfair capital gains tax rate, first.

I urge my colleagues to heed the economist's warning and pass an economic growth package by the March 20 deadline. If we do not, the American people will hold us accountable.

To paraphrase an old saying, now is the time for all good men and women to put aside partisan politics and come to the aid of their country.

Mr. Speaker, we have only 15 days left to pass a real jobs creation bill.

PRESIDENT SHOULD FREE CABINET TO DO THEIR JOBS

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, is it not just too bad that with all the problems of the United States, the President does not think being a Cabinet officer is a full-time job?

Authoritative reports indicate that the 3-day rule is not an administrative procedure or an official act. It is the administration's requirement that certain Cabinet officials spend 3 days a week out in the hustings.

Cabinet officials are political appointments. It is perfectly fine, even a noble enterprise, for them to be politically active. But we have massive economic, governmental, and societal challenges. We need the departmental secretaries addressing these problems, not incessantly drumming up support for the President.

National Journal's Congress Daily has reported that at least one busy Cabinet member views this order with much annoyance.

Mr. Speaker, the President should free the Cabinet to do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am including for the RECORD one paragraph from the February 28, 1992, Congress Daily as follows:

In the wake of Patrick Buchanan's surprise showing in the New Hampshire GOP primary, the White House has issued instructions to several Cabinet members requiring them to step-up their campaign appearances on behalf of President Bush, according to a key GOP congressional source. The source added that the instructions—dubbed the "Three Day Rule"—mandate that all Cabinet members travel at least three days a week to urge support for the president's renomination. The source said at least one busy Bush surrogate views the rule with annoyance, especially because the requirement will remain in effect until the end of the primary season.

FULL DISCLOSURE IS VITAL

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today the Chaplain prayed that we as Members of the House might act with honesty and courage.

Today the Ethics Committee will receive the resolution from the subcommittee relative to the House bank scandal and to the recommendations concerning those Members who have abused the bank.

Today, in the Roll Call newspaper, we read:

While disclosure could involve releasing the names of abusers, it could also mean sending them personal letters and leaving it up to the Members themselves to handle the matter, subject to the pressures of the political marketplace, sources said. Still, sources

believe that a straight public announcement of a relatively small number of abusers is more likely.

Also, in today's Washington Post, page A12, we read:

The potential political damage that could arise from publication of the names of major transgressors has caused the House leadership to look for ways to dampen the impact of any disclosures.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the Chaplain's prayer, once again, and ask for honesty and courage as the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct acts in this matter.

I believe full disclosure is vital.

OUR GOVERNMENT MUST WORK FOR THE PEOPLE

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke with you and my colleagues here about our need to address the shrinking resources of Federal departments and agencies and the resulting, sometimes drastic effect on our constituents.

Our district offices are too often the last chance—sometimes the only change—for Americans to get the help they need from the Federal Government. It is our job, Mr. Speaker, to see that they get that help.

Mr. Speaker, it does no good for Congress to talk about entitlements if the Office of Social Security is not answering its telephones.

It does no good for Congress to talk about stopping sexual discrimination or racial prejudice if the EEOC has a 2-year backlog of cases.

And the record is replete with many other examples.

Mr. Speaker, our Government must work for the people, else the people will lose faith in it. It is the job of this House and this Congress to stop that from happening.

All of us—Democrats and Republicans—should be able to agree on that.

PEOPLE OF AMERICA WANT FULL DISCLOSURE

(Mr. SANTORUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, today the House Ethics Committee is going to decide what to do with the House bank scandal.

There is an article in last week's New York Times, "Congress anxiously awaits to see House Bank's deadbeat list." I am quoting from the article; it says:

If the Democratic leadership has its way, only a few Members at most will be identified as repeatedly overdrawing their accounts by amounts in excess of their month's salary.

That is an abuser.

I think we all know, and the American people know, that is at a minimum an abuser.

What we have is a system here that is decayed and corrupt, and we need to do something about it.

I know this is a very difficult decision for the leadership of the House, because there are a lot of Members here who are gnashing their teeth and wringing their hands about this, but when we took the oath of office, Mr. Speaker, when you took the oath of office, you did not take the oath of office to protect and defend your colleagues. You took the oath of office to protect and defend and be honest with the people in your community and your district and the people of America.

Own up to the people of America and what they want in this institution: full disclosure.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair has entertained eight 1-minute statements by Members from both sides of the aisle pursuant to the Speaker's instructions.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 386 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 287.

□ 1029

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 287) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997, with Mr. MFUME (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 4, 1992, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 102-451.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOWNS

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TOWNS: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the budget for fiscal year 1993 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997 are hereby set forth.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, and October 1, 1996:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$1,168,200,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,264,807,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,347,300,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,431,600,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,508,100,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$0.

Fiscal year 1994: \$0.

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.

Fiscal year 1996: \$0.

Fiscal year 1997: \$0.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$85,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$91,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$96,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$102,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$109,200,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$1,203,104,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,176,216,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,178,463,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,191,098,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,235,996,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$1,198,479,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,213,857,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,228,109,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,253,654,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,297,746,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$322,366,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$262,029,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$204,053,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$157,382,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$137,058,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993: \$4,480,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$4,884,100,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$5,236,400,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$5,581,600,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,982,500,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, and October 1, 1996, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,700,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$114,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$117,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$20,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$120,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$20,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$123,100,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1993 through 1997 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$238,838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$275,529,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,809,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$251,334,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$187,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$217,525,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$162,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$191,582,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$167,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$175,583,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,046,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,694,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,624,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,403,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,222,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,070,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,842,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,861,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,484,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,300,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,582,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,121,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,251,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,002,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,883,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,650,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,626,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,321,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,369,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,617,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,466,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,095,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,663,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,278,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,849,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,468,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,067,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,665,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,286,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,869,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,886,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,579,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,674,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,320,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,418,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,087,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,883,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,169,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,706,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,935,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,208,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,581,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,863,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,190,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,543,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,908,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,246,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,625,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,975,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,900,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,326,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$63,030,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$60,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,842,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,837,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$62,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,189,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,407,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$64,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,682,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,998,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$66,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,175,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,610,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitment, \$69,000,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,020,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,328,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,569,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,828,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,031,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,476,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,752,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,324,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,473,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,777,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,877,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,279,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,842,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,131,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,708,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,496,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,190,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,659,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,521,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,089,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$52,988,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,216,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,040,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$15,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,730,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,589,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,817,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,952,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,936,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,600,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$121,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,991,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$125,676,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$116,023,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$129,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,830,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$134,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,310,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$139,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$128,790,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$127,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$130,613,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$132,324,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$136,667,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$158,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$141,776,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$146,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$214,018,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$203,007,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$221,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,315,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$228,999,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$217,217,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$237,560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,338,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$246,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$233,458,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(14) Social security (650):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$305,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,097,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$316,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$316,009,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$326,380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$323,244,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$338,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$335,328,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$350,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,412,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,523,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$28,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,838,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$22,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,838,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,100,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,541,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,001,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,300,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,677,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,354,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,205,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,871,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,359,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,291,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,933,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,507,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,662,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,952,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,154,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,618,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,948,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,933,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,711,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net interest (900):

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$214,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,146,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$231,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$262,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$243,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$278,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$253,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$295,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$264,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$311,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1993:

- (A) New budget authority, \$3,795,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1993:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$40,034,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$40,034,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$40,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$40,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$42,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$42,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$45,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$45,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TOWNS] will be recognized for 4 hours and a Member opposed will be recognized for 4 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

□ 1030

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. In this time I am going to try to advise the Members where I think the course of debate will take us in terms of times for votes.

We are beginning at 10:30. If the full 8 hours are used, that takes us to roughly 6:30.

I would anticipate that we would not use the full 8 hours. If that is the case, then the likelihood is that we may perhaps get to a vote on this issue sometime in the 5 to 6 o'clock timeframe. An hour then would be used for debate on the final disposal of the budget resolution. I would suspect that hour would be used, so I guess my best guidance to the Members would be perhaps final disposal of the issue perhaps by sometime around 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for this opportunity to discuss the budget jointly proposed as an alternative for fiscal year 1993 by the Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus.

We present this budget as a guide for the challenge of the new realities facing the people in a world of new realities. The new realities faced by this country have been shaped by the changes of the old realities. We cannot turn away from the fact that the political and economic conventional wisdom which formed the geopolitics of the previous 4 decades of the American landscape are now gone. The threat posed by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries is as dead as the ideology of communism which gave it birth. Yet this threat is rapidly being replaced by another threat to the national security—unemployment, homelessness, illegal drug trafficking and violence. And unlike the Soviet Union, these threats are not on distant shores from faceless and nameless enemies—there is no evil empire at the forefront or in the background. These threats are on our own shores, in our own homes, carried on the shoulders of our people and living in the hearts of our own children. It can be seen in the faces of millions of unemployed Americans who are no longer counted in the official statistics because they have been out of a job so long that they are no longer showing up on the computers. The Labor Dept. officially calls

them discouraged. But if you look in their faces, as I have, what you will see it not merely some kind of malaise. It is the fear, anxiety and hopelessness of people who feel forgotten and betrayed by their leaders. As Pogo said—"We have seen the enemy and it is us." It is us if we fail to take this opportunity to turn around the economic and social development of this country. It is us if we fail to use the power and authority vested in us by the Constitution, law and the will of the people. It is us if we fail to provide jobs to the jobless, food to the hungry, homes to those living on the street; education to those eager to learn and training to those yearning to work. It is us if we fail to seize this day, this moment, this opportunity, to correct some major mistakes that we made over several years.

The budget that we offer today, seeks to restore the pride of all Americans and maintain the greatness of this country—by taking into account the changed face of the world—and the strained face of this Nation. The TOWNS-DELLUMS alternative looks at every sector of this Nation—urban and rural; factory, farm and service sectors; rich, middle class and poor; black, Hispanic, Asian native American, white and native American and tries to provide help to a suffering people. This budget is not only good for minorities and women, but for all Americans who have felt the pain of a tight economy. Our mission and our duty as Members of Congress and Members of the Congressional Black Caucus is to provide the relief that they seek.

Today we will talk a great deal about the positive effects that this initiative will have for native Americans and Americans of African-Hispanic and Asian descent. We will talk about the positive effects that this budget will have on their lives. It may seem that we are focused on them, but make no mistake they will not be the only beneficiaries. If our plan is adopted America will be the beneficiary. But we will focus on these groups of Americans because for the last 2 decades, they have been forgotten and neglected in the economic policies of this country. We will talk about the cruel economic realities that affect our communities—I am talking about realities that cannot be cured by quite fixes or a lot of rhetoric. We are talking about things that need to be fixed, which this budget addresses.

I hope that my colleagues will seize this moment to move this country in a new direction.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to pause and yield to a gentleman who over the last 3½ months has worked day and night to formulate this budget, one who has been the conscience of this Congress down through the years, making certain that those who were left out and locked out would be able to come in.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] for his very generous remarks, and secondly simply to say that I rise today with a great sense of pride and pleasure to have assumed the responsibility on behalf of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and my distinguished colleagues of the Progressive Caucus to attempt to establish the framework for a new budget that will allow us to march forward into the 21st century.

My job today will be to attempt to set the stage for this debate; but prior to doing that, I would like to make an observation that is extremely painful to me. If you will note, we are about the business and have been over the last 24 hours or so of debating the national budget for this country for this year and into the future, but there are very few Members of the House of Representatives who are here today prepared to engage us in a substantive, serious and dignified debate on the future of this Nation and America's role in the world.

I would secondly observe that even in the Press Gallery, we find that on such an auspicious occasion that there are literally no members of the press here to report to the American people a desire on the part of serious Members of this House to grapple with the substantive problems of this country.

I make those observations with a great sense of embarrassment and a great sense of pain. Having said that, I would like to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I awakened about 4 a.m. this morning and prayed that in some way I would have the strength to communicate to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my colleagues and through the Chair to the American people the significance of this moment.

As I have said on the floor on more than one occasion over the last few days that this moment within which we find ourselves, in my opinion, is not a political moment. It is not a partisan moment, but an incredibly historic moment. Most of us spend our lives as politicians tinkering at the margins, Mr. Chairman, of policies that pre-date us, feeling our impotency each day, each week, each year that we serve the American people in this legislature, but we now have this extraordinary opportunity, for if I had come to the floor just a short while back and said the Berlin Wall will crumble without a shot being fired, that the Warsaw Pact will evaporate and vanish from the radar screen, that the hammer and sickle will no longer fly over the Kremlin, that it will be replaced by a red, white, and blue flag, that the Soviet Union as we have known it will dis-

sipate, will evaporate, and that a non-communist will be the President of Russia, most people would think that I have taken flight from my senses.

□ 1050

But the fact of the matter is that those are the realities. So this is an incredible moment to grapple with each other on substantive matters.

Mr. Chairman, to further set the stage, we came into this budget with four alternatives, two offered by my distinguished colleagues on that side of the aisle and two by my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle. My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TOWNS], I, and others visited with the Speaker just a few short days ago, and we said, "Mr. Speaker, this moment is so extraordinary, pregnant with so much potential, because there is so much pain and economic and social dislocation in this Nation and such extraordinary developments in the world, that we ought to take some time to slow this process down and focus the American people and focus our colleagues on a budget for this Nation. Let's take some time to debate it."

He then said, "What kind of time are you talking about?" We said, "Well, since there are four proposals, Mr. Speaker, let each proposal see the full light of day, let each proposal be debated one day. Let the Republican alternative offered by the distinguished gentleman from California on the other side of the aisle be debated all day, let's look at the merits, the pros and the cons, which is what this is all about, and let's then allow President Bush's budget to be exposed to the scrutiny of 435 Members of Congress. Let's look at the efficacy or the lack thereof, the strength or the lack thereof of those proposals for an entire day. Then have a vote. Let's then expose the Congressional Black Caucus to the full light of day, let us grapple with each other, let's engage each other and then the budget proposal." But an extraordinary thing occurred. We appeared to be the only ones prepared to stand out here all day and to expose our ideas to our colleagues and say, "Take us on," because we have no problem with disagreement. That is what the political process is all about, the give and take of different values, different principles, different ideologies, different analyses, different views.

So, that is what brings us here today with this budget, with 8 hours.

Now, no other budget even asked for that amount of time. We are proud of this product. We have worked diligently. We call our budget a budget for new world realities and for rebuilding America.

Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting 21 years for this moment, and have suffered in these Chambers for 21 years, doing battle as Don Quixote, tinkering

at the margins, but now we have this extraordinary moment.

So, we want to take this opportunity to speak. Mr. Chairman, I not only want to speak to you and my colleagues, I want to speak to America, to those mothers and fathers who are frightened to death that drugs and violence are harming their children and their communities, and I want to talk with those parents who feel that our contribution to education in this country is not equipping their children to grapple and cope with the rapidly changing world. I want to talk with those senior citizens who feel the fear of advancing years, who are concerned about the future of this economy and the fabric of our society.

I want to talk with those American people who live in communities where the factories have closed down, major corporations have laid off thousands of people.

I want to talk with those people, those American people, those American people who never thought, Mr. Chairman, in their lifetimes that they would be welfare recipients, because in some way they felt that the great American dream would give them employment until they chose to retire, now finding themselves in long lines wrapped around street corners throughout America to obtain a mere pittance to survive for themselves and their children.

I want to talk with all of those American people, to help them understand the significance of this moment and the fact that there are Members of Congress prepared to grapple substantively with these serious issues. The fact that many of us who are the architects of this budget happen to be black is simply that; but this is a national budget. This is a budget for the entire America, as my colleague who spoke before me so eloquently pointed out.

Mr. Chairman, we stepped forward after a 3½-month process, and we then said we want to put forward to the American people a four-point program. One, let us shake off the straitjacket of the 1990 budget agreement that locked us into a 5-year budgeting process that has now been overcome by events. The world has changed since that time. The budget agreement is an antiquated document. We cannot allow ourselves to simply march forward in lock step to a proposal that no longer is relevant.

Therefore, at a minimum, we should bring down the walls that separate the military budget from the domestic budget, to allow us to realter the national priorities of this Nation. But we would not discuss this matter or deliberate on this matter today; that will be taken care of subsequently.

A second part of our proposal was to look at our taxing structure, not in an effort to energize the economy, because we have listened carefully to econo-

mists, left, right and center, who do not believe you can really truly energize this economy through the tax structure.

Our approach was to approach taxes on a tax equity basis, to tax those extraordinarily wealthy people who benefited over the past 10 or 12 years with exorbitant, extraordinary tax breaks and the corporate elite—the top 10 percent that earn 90 percent of the wealth of this Nation—to give back some of the multibillions of dollars that they benefited over that period of time, and give it to the working and middle-class people of this country in the form of tax equity.

But events have overtaken us in that regard. The House has acted on a tax proposal which leaves us then with the other two parts of our program.

One, against the backdrop of a reality of a changing world, let us step back and write a new military budget based on the new realities of the world.

The military budget reflects our national security needs, which in turn reflects what our thoughts are about the threats to the United States. Let us do that in realistic terms and write a new military budget. And if there is a so-called peace dividend, then let us begin to address the myriad social and economic problems that we abandoned as we allowed our military budget to skyrocket to, at one point, \$312 billion per annum, and begin to redirect those resources to rebuild the economic infrastructure, increase education, generate employment, deal with the health problems of the Nation and many other social problems and economic realities that require our urgent attention.

To the first point, rebuilding a new military budget: Mr. Chairman, for four and a half decades the guiding light that has stimulated America's high level of military readiness for that period of time was the Soviet threat and the potential for fighting a war in Europe with the Warsaw Pact, for four and a half decades.

On January 22 of this year the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Gates, the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lieutenant General Clapper, made the following interesting and, in my opinion, pointed observation: One, the former Soviet Union military capability on the decline; Russian weapon procurement down by 80 percent—80 percent; Soviet investment in research and development on military technology down by 30 percent; former Soviet strategic capability on the decline; and, finally, paraphrasing from Lieutenant General Clapper, director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, that the former Soviet Union poses no significant threat, and I repeat for purposes of emphasis, no significant threat to the United States or to NATO.

□ 1050

Conclusion: The Warsaw Pact no longer exists. It has vanished off the

radar screen as a threat to this Nation. The Soviet Union that has acted as the big bogeyman for \$300 billion military budgets has now so significantly reduced, and declined and diminished that any reasonable person has come to the conclusion that they pose no major threat.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the president of Russia came to the United States and not only said that he is not interested in continuing to be our adversary, but he said:

I want to be your friend. And, incidentally, if you have any food, we need it to feed our people, and, if you perceive us as a nuclear threat, Mr. President, American people, we're prepared to go even below your proposal to bring greater stability and a sense of peace to the world.

Mr. Chairman, what is the significance of these two threats, now either having disappeared or dissipated?

Using the baseline of \$301 billion, which is what the Committee on the Budget, what everyone, is using, it is where we have been for the past decade: approximately \$300 billion per annum. I say to my colleagues and the American people, "You need to know that we have been spending between 50 and 70 percent of that \$300 billion on two threats, the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union. Now you don't have to be a Ph.D. in mathematics to do simple arithmetic. Fifty to seventy percent of \$300 billion means that on an annual basis we have been spending between \$150 and \$210 billion per year on those two threats—\$210 billion.

Now, if one of those threats where we have been spending, and it is reports from the Pentagon, not RON DELLUMS' articulation, \$150 billion a year, that threat is now vanished, the Soviet Union dissipated, I ask, "We can't find some money out of that \$210 billion in a post-cold-war, post-Soviet Union environment, to redirect to address the myriad economic, and social pain and dislocation?" That staggers the imagination. It boggles the mind.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States stood right here just a few weeks ago and stated to us and to the American people that he was prepared to cut over a 5-year period \$50 billion from the military budget. Conclusion: Even the President understands that the world has changed and that the military budget has to be reduced.

The only question for debate now is: How much? What are our real national security needs? What is the threat? And what force do we see out there in the outyears? It is no longer a debate of whether it is going down. The President of the United States said it is going down. So now an honest and legitimate debate can be: Is it enough?

Mr. Chairman, my response is: "No; it is not enough, because that means that the President has singularly stated to the American people that, out of

that \$210 billion that we have used as a threat to the American people, out of that only a \$10 billion reduction per year can take place." That means that roughly one-sixth of the budget will be reduced over a 5-year period, which means that five-sixths of the budget will remain.

Question: "How do you justify five-sixths of the budget remaining from 70 percent of the threat that has either been reduced or diminished? That's only a 17-percent reduction, but 70 percent of the threat is either gone or significantly removed."

The answer was, "Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't know where the next Noriega or Saddam Hussein is coming from." Understand what that means. That means that we are saying that we will keep in place five-sixths of the military budget to prepare for a Panama, and an Iraq, and a Korea that will pose five times the threat that the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact posed that acted as the linchpin for our high level of military readiness for four-and-a-half decades. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, that defies understanding.

And now we hear our colleagues saying again, using cold war rhetoric and worst-case-scenario politics that got us into this position in the first place—for 21 years they have been telling me. "The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming. We can't cut the military budget." But I would observe, Mr. Chairman, that finally the Russians actually did come. They came to America. But they came and sat down in the back of the Committee on Armed Services' room in peace. They came asking for assistance. They did not come fighting a war. But here we are now again in a worst-case scenario.

I would ask, "Do you, Mr. Chairman; do you, Members of this body; do you, American people, actually believe that we need to spend five-sixths of \$300 billion preparing to simultaneously, and that's the theory here, fight a war in Panama, fight an equivalent war in Iraq, fight a war in Korea, and fight a war in the former Soviet Union that might be based on a civil war conflict—simultaneously three or four wars that we'd be fighting all together?" Again I would suggest to my colleagues that that is a flight into fantasy, that again it is a worst-case-scenario notion.

Now they are saying the greatest fear is uncertainty. So I would ask, "Do you really believe that, Mr. Chairman, that we actually would be fighting three or four wars simultaneously?" I do not believe that. We looked out there, and we said, based on a number of lessons, that we can significantly reduce the military budget. In fact, we said that within 4 years we could cut this military budget in half.

Now I might add parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, that former Director of the

Central Intelligence Agency, William Colby, suggested we cut it in half in 5 years. We simply got there 1 year earlier, so this is no extraordinary idea, to cut the budget in half within 4 years.

We did not come to that one-half in an arbitrary way. We looked at a changing world. We saw a reduced threat. We looked at the lessons of the Persian Gulf war.

What are the lessons of the Persian Gulf war? We amassed 500,000 troops in the desert. Yet, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, within hours, with a massive technological capability, we rendered the Iraqi Army helpless without 500,000 troops fighting, as we have contemplated war in the past. We fought this war in a very different way. We used Stealth technology, we used guided munitions, we used smart bombs and saturation bombing. The fact of the matter is that, if any American people watched that war unfold on CNN, they should have become as frightened as I was because we had an opportunity to see the future of war, and the future of war is not men against men and women against women in the battlefield shooting from behind trees. The war of the future is highly technological. The war of the future is standoff capability with smart weaponry.

Ponder for a moment what would happen to us in that kind of a war. It staggers the imagination. It should frighten us to the bottom of the soles of our feet. But what it means is that a whole notion of force structure has to change, that we must abandon old thinking. We do not need all of the troops that we need. If the Iraqis, as the President said to the American people, were the fourth largest standing army in the world, and we are now preparing with a major military budget in a post-cold-war environment to fight Third World countries, name the Third World countries that have a military force anywhere near what the Iraqis had. And within a matter of hours we gained air superiority, within a matter of days we had killed so many people that it should stagger the imagination and render everyone self-conscious about the insanity of war as a way of solving problems, but, recognizing that the world is not a totally peaceful place, we set out a minimum of 4 years to reduce these forces.

I say, "For every weapon system that you purchase that you do not need, every troop that you deploy out there that you do not need, you rob our children of education, you rob our workers of employment."

□ 1100

You rob the social and economic fabric of this Nation of the resources it needs to repair itself, to give our children a dream and a vision for the future."

We start with a \$50 billion cut in budget authority in fiscal year 1993,

but we take the long view. We recognize that the world does not change overnight. This is a major first step.

Mr. Chairman, if the question to me is: Is there a peace dividend in a post-cold war, post-Soviet Union environment, I will give an answer. Within 60 seconds I will lay before you \$1 trillion, not \$1 million, not \$1 billion but \$1 trillion in now-year dollars, real money, no smoke and mirrors, no accounting procedures, real money in now-year dollars that we can use as a peace dividend to begin to address the myriad social problems in this country.

How do we do that? If we start with a \$300 billion budget and in 4 fiscal years, to fiscal year 1996, we reduce that military budget to one-half, \$150 billion, starting with a \$50 billion cut in fiscal year 1993, we save \$400 billion that we normally would have been spending on defense that in a post-cold war, post-Soviet Union environment we no longer have to spend on the military.

A reasonable person can understand that. That is \$400 billion. If we decide to level-spend at \$150 billion for the next 4 fiscal years, 1997 through fiscal year 2000—that is 4 additional years at \$150 billion off a baseline of \$300 billion—we save \$150 billion each year for 4 years. Four times \$150 billion is \$600 billion. Now, \$600 billion plus \$400 billion in an 8-year period is \$1 trillion. That is \$1 trillion, Mr. Chairman. So the answer is, yes, there is a peace dividend.

To digress for a moment, when I first came here in 1971, I took the well of the House and I said that we must reorder the national priorities of this Nation and begin to address the myriad social and economic problems and human pain in this country. I remember vividly one of my colleagues walked up to me after I had spoken in the well with some sense of self-consciousness and fear and trepidation after one of the early speeches in my then budding career as a Member of the House of Representatives, and my colleague patted me on the back and congratulated me for an eloquent statement about the human condition. "But," he said, "Mr. DELLUMS, you are very naive."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "I would like to join you in solving the problems of this Nation, but you don't understand the Soviet threat and the Communist menace. We don't have the time nor the energy nor the money at this point to solve these problems. We have to put them off the table for a while while we address the Soviet threat and the Communist menace. We don't have the money to do it."

Twenty-one years later, I confront my colleagues and I challenge them, Mr. Chairman. I say to the American people that the Soviet threat is gone. The Warsaw Pact has vanished off the screen.

So I ask, "What is your rationale now? I have just given you \$1 trillion

over an 8-year period to the year 2000 as a peace dividend. So don't tell me there is no money there." So I ask, Mr. Chairman, "What is your rationale now?"

I have been waiting 21 years with some significant pain. So here we are. We cannot avoid this moment. This moment is pregnant with the potential for tremendous change. The American people look at the Congress with hope and anxiety, hope that we will grapple with the issues and anxiety that maybe we will not.

But we offer a proposal. We say that we can write a military budget that addresses our military security needs in very real terms, and that even in doing so we can free up \$1 trillion to begin to address the myriad problems of this country.

For those who say we are not interested in reducing the deficit, here is my response: We are responsible people. Our budget reduces the deficit significantly, and in conservative terms it takes it down to slightly over \$100 billion by 1997. That is conservative because there are a number of factors that contribute to the deficit.

Inflation, Mr. Chairman, contributes to the deficit. Our proposal says, let us rebuild America's economic infrastructure, let us generate employment, and let us put people back to work. When they are working, they pay taxes and the deficit starts to come down.

The rising military budget that is capital intensive, as opposed to being labor intensive, is now on the down curve. Our budget says we can take it down to one-half, and then if we wish, we can level it out to the year 2000, so that contributes to reducing the deficit.

We said that a tax equity package makes sense to us. That would contribute to reducing the deficit. The skyrocketing cost of health care is contributing to the deficit. I recognize we are in the primitive stages of a debate on health, but at least it is now back on the front burner. The American people have demanded that we address health, and if we are ever able to come to terms with giving the American people access to quality health care, where the cost is captured and controlled and affordable to the American people, we will further reduce the deficit.

The S&L crisis contributed to the deficit. We take it off budget, but the fact of the matter is that we have to take some money to pay for it. I hope that is a temporary solution.

As I said, we are showing you a trillion dollars. We are prepared to take some part of that trillion dollars and contribute some cash money to contribute to lowering the deficit. Then, with the rest of it, we want to respond to the pain of the American people.

What are the American people saying? They are saying, "We want jobs." Our response is that we take a signifi-

cant portion of this money, and let us begin to rebuild America's economic infrastructure.

Studies show that if we would just begin to rebuild America's railroads, Mr. Chairman, we would generate in excess of a million jobs. If we made American cities a monument to our genius and our humanity rather than a monument to our insanity, we would generate employment.

If we would agree to address the housing needs of this country, we would recognize that someone has to build the houses, repair the homes, and maintain housing units, and with ancillary employment we would generate jobs.

If we would agree to expand our potential in education and reach out to our children, they would begin to dream again. Studies that just came across the wire yesterday pointed out that most American children do not believe that they will inherit a world as good as the world their parents inherited. That is frightening. It means that we have ripped from our own children the hopes and the dreams that they could go beyond their own parents. Many of our parents, in the quiet and solitude of their own minds and their homes, feel that they are about to turn over a world to their children that in no way allows them to come close to what they received. Our theories have always been that we will give our children a better world than the world that was given to us.

The way we generate employment is not in a vacuum. We cannot generate a jobs program in a vacuum, Mr. Chairman. The way we generate employment is when a society commits itself to solving other problems and in the commitment to solve those problems generates employment.

Our industrial base is declining. Our economic base is deteriorating. If we agree to address that problem, we are going to generate employment. Our economic infrastructure is collapsing. To rebuild it generates employment.

□ 1110

Dealing with the myriad other social problems, we generate employment. That is our effort. That is our desire. Let us now reshape the priorities of this country.

Finally, there is going to be a great deal of pain, I would say to my colleagues, as the military budget goes down. There is no question, because as troops come home and they are deactivated and demobilized they become unemployed. As we shut down plants that build bombs and planes that are no longer necessary, there are real human beings out there building those systems.

In my 21-plus years in the national Congress no one has ever walked up to me, Mr. Chairman, and said, "I demand a job building a bomb." No one has

ever said that to me. No one has ever said, "Mr. Chairman, I demand a job building an MX missile. I must have it."

What they have said to all of us, "I demand the right as a dignified American citizen to work, to feed my children, to raise my family, and to function with dignity and pride in this Nation."

I believe that the American people, given the option to build transit cars or B-2 bombers, would opt to build transit cars. It gives them employment. It is in their long-term interest, because it is environmentally sound and they turn over an environmentally safe world to their children.

What am I saying? Economic conversion must be the centerpiece of this major point job departure as we strike out toward the 21st century. We have often used economic conversion as a throw-away line, "If we convert from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy."

Studies show for every dollar we spend on the nonmilitary side of the budget we generate more employment than we do on the military side. One is capital-intensive, one is labor-intensive. We all know that.

Now we are faced with the reality in a post-Soviet Union post-cold war environment of actually making the motion of conversion a reality. How do we really do that? Now it is no longer speechmaking, it is real. We have to confront it. We must now take our scientific genius, our Ph.D's, our engineers, our scholars, our business community people, our economic development people, our workers, our community people, our citizens and bring them together to address this issue.

Remember just a few weeks ago when a major controversy occurred in Los Angeles, when one of the political bodies there gave a contract to the Japanese to build mass transit cars? Great political furor arose. That body withdrew the contract. But think about that. Here is a classic example of the need for economic conversion. Why were the Japanese better able to build an efficient transit car? Because their government contributed to technology development. Their government did not leave it just to the corporations to decide what research and development are necessary. They said, "We, the government, must participate in the process of research and development and technology development to enhance the quality of life."

We have the genius and the acumen and the capability and the working capacity in this Nation to build whatever we need to build, but we must take the political step and put our economic might behind making economic conversion a reality, not simply a political throwaway line that we make on the stump to gain immediate applause.

Our budget challenges this Nation to that point. We attempt to address con-

version inside the military and outside. For those young people coming home from the military, let us write a new GI bill. Let us have housing allowances. Let us have unemployment compensation for them. Let us have training. Let us give them the opportunity. Let us not just drop them out.

We should not be as insensitive to the pain, as the military budget goes down, as many of my colleagues were when the military budget went up, as many of us were screaming that in the aftermath of a rapidly rising military budget we are going to have homeless, helpless, jobless, and poverty-stricken people and children without dreams and without hope.

Our budget attempts to reconcile both levels of pain, economic conversion as the budget goes down, to address the pain and dislocation of people. These are not statistics, they are real human beings.

Let us also address the pain as the budget went up, because we left behind millions of American people.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, this, as I said before, is not a political moment. I would say to my colleagues, this is not a partisan moment. We have marched into the well year in and year out, attempting to challenge our colleagues to a higher level of discussion and debate. This moment dictates that. It must happen.

We cannot allow ourselves to just get into the battle of Republican versus Democrat and engaging in stump speaking. We have to grapple with the realities of the world, the realities of this Nation.

In the time that my colleague has generously given me to lay out the parameters of our budget we have said, "Here is a budget for the new world realities," and we are prepared to discuss and debate and talk about those issues. We hope that the time is not taken to simply bash another proposal. Grapple with us. We spent 3½ months to write a budget that we are prepared to defend and we are prepared to challenge our colleagues. Do not use the time to engage in a debate on another budget that is not before us. Dignify us and dignify this moment.

We are prepared to take them on not in a partisan and political way, but in an intellectually honest way and in the comity of give and take that ought to be the order of the day on this floor.

We said to the Members that the budget can be reduced. We said to the Members that there is a peace dividend. We said to the Members that it can be redirected so that we can simultaneously face the reality of the world as it is changing and also address the human condition on our people in a substantive and powerful way.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will note that the Chair has recognized two

Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in support of the amendment.

Does any Member rise in opposition?

Mr. GRADISON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] is recognized for 4 hours.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] the distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all that I appreciate very much the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], the distinguished ranking member, allowing me to take such time as necessary.

Let me say to my colleagues on the other side that I take very seriously what I think they are trying to get at, and that I came here today, and a number of my colleagues have said, "Please do not take any time. Let us yield back our 4 hours. Let us get out of town early."

As the Members know, I tried to come in earlier to give us the maximum amount of time to debate today. I take very seriously what the Members are trying to accomplish, and I am going to, frankly, speak at some length. I hope my colleagues will not object.

My only, I guess, mild concern about the earlier comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my good friend, is that I note the same lack of serious participation on his side of the aisle that we have on our side. The gentleman earlier commented on the lack of Republican involvement. I just want to point out that in some ways I wish the leadership from both sides were more aggressive here.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I place no political or partisan characterization on it. I simply said my observation was that there is not participation in this House at this significant moment. I concur in the gentleman's comment.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I want to, for a little while, lay out an intellectual framework. I deliberately have changed my schedule to be able to do this today, because I really hope as people all over America read this record, and I know that they are deliberately, earnestly, and sincerely laying out a record and creating a framework of thought, and I deliberately wanted to create an alternative analysis and engage in a dialog.

For a little while I am going to lay out a framework. Then I will be glad for such time as seems appropriate,

without being too repetitive, to genuinely open up a dialog.

Let me say I take very, very seriously both the intellectual arguments of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the intense passionate cry from the hearts of virtually every Member on the Democratic side who will speak during these hours. I do not see how any decent human being can look at the worst problems of poverty and the worst problems of failure in American society and not have a level of anguish which should engage them mentally and morally and in terms of their courage to address the problems.

I want to say I respect deeply the emotional commitment, the integrity, and the intensity with which those Members on the Democratic side will speak before we get to a vote on their amendment.

I am only going to talk briefly about your amendment, but I do not think that is the essence of what you are trying to say. I think that while you have labored hard on this budget, you do not expect it to pass, but you do expect it to be a framework for debate about how we solve America's problems.

□ 1120

I want to challenge my dear friend from Berkeley who came here as one of the great revolutionaries and radicals of his time, who has gradually matured into a senior subcommittee chairman, and has become one of the more important Members of the collective leadership of this body. Not that he is not in his heart still willing to be radical, but to some extent now, he is a cultured and well dressed radical.

Mr. DELLUMS. I was actually born in Oakland, sir.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman from Oakland. I thought at one point you had served in Berkeley in the city council. I read a little bit about you. I know that you try as much as you can to claim roots, and I know that you have some family in Texas, and we can talk about all of that. The point is that I am going to argue for a couple of minutes is that I have been more of a revolutionary today than you are, and you can listen for a while and then decide later if I failed the test. And I am going to argue three levels—political, intellectual, and economic.

Politically, part of our difference I believe is whether we should raise taxes on working Americans to transfer the money to government bureaucracy, or whether in fact if your primary interest is helping the poor and creating jobs and establishing opportunity we should find a way to rethink the whole structure of our Tax Code, and particularly to help rising, younger entrepreneurs, and particularly to help small businesses, because those are, to a peculiar degree, the primary way in which minorities rise. It is precisely accelerating the emergency of

entrepreneurs and by encouraging the growth of small business, which is the way historically that people who are in minority status, whether it was the Irish Catholics at the turn of the century, the Italian Catholics in the 1930's, or somebody who is black, Hispanic, or Asian today, business in the end is the primary driving force for truly becoming wealthy in America.

Intellectually my concern is, and I try to say it as simple as I can, is the central problem in American government resources or restructuring. My good friend, I think, would argue it is largely resources. If there was enough money, New York City would work. If we could shrink the Pentagon by 50 percent and take the money and transfer it to Oakland and Detroit and New York, they would work dramatically better.

I am going to argue today that the No. 1 problem in American government is restructuring, in fact revolutionary restructuring. My good friend mentioned the Japanese. Let me suggest if you read the MIT study, "The Machine That Changed The World," which is essentially a study of Toyota, but also it takes a look at 95 other auto plants around the planet, that book, "The Machine That Changed The World," argues that it is an entire restructuring, psychologically, culturally, and in management which makes Toyota so dramatically better. And an analogous American example is one from the Wall Street Journal, a story on Tuesday about Chrysler, in which, it has a long section on how much Chrysler has had to change internally.

I would argue that city government in America, and when we talk about poverty I know my good friend from Mississippi is going to speak presently, and there is a great deal of rural poverty, but when we talk about the most bleak and desperate examples of poverty in America, we are consistently talking about our biggest cities. They are unbelievably tragic for those who are poor. Therefore, I think there is a challenge intellectually to talk about.

Analytically I would question, and this is one place where I may at the very end, if we have time, engage in a little bit of questioning about the defense bill, but I want to ask four questions. How much can we disarm, a legitimate place to debate? How fast can we disarm? What does demobilization cost us in unemployment, in chaos, and in changed lives? How dangerous will the world remain, and what forces will we need in a dangerous world?

I agree entirely with my good friend from California that that core debate is a legitimate debate that we have. We have won the cold war. After victory comes some level of demobilization, and I believe the burden is in fact on the Pentagon to explain and defend its size, its force structure, and its missions. I think what the gentleman is

asking there is totally reasonable as the beginning of a dialog. I have some question in his budget with whether or not as a realistic management question, even if we agree on the wisdom of that speed of demobilization, whether or not we could do it. I will say, however, at the risk of strengthening your argument, between 1815 and 1816 the Royal Navy declined from 141,000 to 19,000, and by 1817, 94 percent of the active duty officers were no longer in service. Having beaten Napoleon, the British radically demobilized. I am not saying that that is good. I would not defend it. But I would argue, at least precisely in the spirit of intellectual clarity and boldness that the gentleman is trying to present, that it is the Pentagon that has to defend why that is not valid, and that the burden has to be on the Military Establishment and the military analysts to explain the size of the threat and the danger. And we may get that, but I think that is secondary.

Let me say, while I think that makes it hard to vote for your budget, I think the core of your passion is how do we help the poor. How do we restructure an opportunity society where the poorest child, the smallest minority, the most desperate neighborhood is drawn into America. That is a question which can be answered without fighting over the Pentagon. So I want to come back and focus.

I am going to raise the following theoretical framework: I believe we have crippled ourselves. I said "we," not you. We have crippled ourselves because we segment American government in society into a series of tunnels. And then we as leaders at the top in Washington, we peer down a tunnel. We have a tunnel called welfare, a tunnel called crime and drugs, a tunnel called education, and then we have a tunnel called health. We can go down the list. We have Jack Kemp's tunnel called housing.

I believe that the first core problem we face is that we have to break down the tunnels and realize we have that large room called human beings living in a neighborhood. We cannot talk about education without prenatal care, because without prenatal care we are going to have too many children who are born underweight, and we are going to have enormous problems educating them. We cannot talk about education without talking about breakfast and lunch service, because if they are not fed, and they live in a single head of household family, and nobody really nurtures them, they are not going to be able to learn very much because they are too hungry. We cannot talk about growing up in an inner city without talking about violence and drugs, because if you literally cannot walk out the door, as in the tragic case of the young girl who said in the New York Times last year, "I am afraid to look

out of my window because I don't want to get shot in the face," and she was 6 years old, then we cannot talk about solving that.

So I walk all the way around the system we now have and suggest that we need one room called human beings in a neighborhood. Then we need to think through how we integrate and pull together all of those aspects that are necessary for every American to have the opportunity that the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Constitution guarantee. So that is my first point. And to some extent I would suggest while you have a start here that I would love, I would cherish the opportunity to work with all Members of the Congress who care most about helping the poor, and genuinely erasing the blackboard. I used to be a teacher so I always think of blackboards. Erase the blackboard and start with people, and come back to services and systems. That is the first point.

So I would argue that it is restructuring that is the issue, and revolutionary restructuring.

My second point would be that the core value structure, and I am sure on this the gentleman is going to want to come back and take me on, but the core value structure of those who most authentically care about the poor has been, for legitimate, historical reasons, less open to the rules of productivity than hopefully they will be. I will tell you candidly, I believe this is partly an outgrowth of the civil rights movement when the business and productive communities of America walked off from their responsibilities, and when the only help that those who cared passionately about breaking down segregation could find were from those on the left who intellectually disputed the basic pattern of capitalism. I would say to my dearest friends who care about the poor, look at the lesson of Russia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and ask yourself if you are going to try to have Yeltsin be productive, and if we are going to try to teach them how to break down and have debureaucratization, entrepreneurship, free enterprise, and incentive, are there a set of principles that we want to say to Eastern Europe that we also want to say to the south Bronx? Are there a set of principles that we want to say to Poland that we also want to say to Detroit?

□ 1130

Are they in fact very similar? I will give you one example that I think that everyone who cares about the inner city all ought to take seriously.

We ought to find a way to radically advantage poor entrepreneurs in the inner city. If that means the Government, for example, would take up their matching on FICA, if that means the Government would, in effect, have no tax on them for 5 years as long as they

are creating jobs, if that would mean a wide range of radical incentives that say you create jobs in our poorest neighborhoods and you will get rich and, yes, I know that for some of our friends the idea of advocating wealth is frightening, but I think the truth is all across the planet socialism and communism as intellectual models are disintegrating, and the truth is that incentives work. Whether they are good or bad in terms of the abstract, they work. They work for baseball players, they work for basketball players. I want to argue that they could work for establishing job creation in our poorest neighborhoods.

And so my second argument, first having suggested we want a big room to talk this thing through involving holistically all of the human community in the neighborhood, all the services, and all the systems.

My second argument is, and my second challenge is, to those who most care about the poorest: Let us take the daring risk, I will walk into a room of negotiation and conversation and invention, and I will stipulate that I have to bear the burden as a Republican leader of trying to solve problems for the poorest, least advantaged, most discriminated against, and weakest members of our society. Would you then be willing to suspend your disbelief in incentives and in economics and in Adam Smith and Alexander Hamilton, and let us brainstorm together and try to design an incentive-driven system that maximizes the growth of jobs and opportunities and that, again, is designed in totality?

Let me tell you what I mean by totality. I do not care how much profit there is, opening a factory in the inner city, if you think you are going to get shot walking to your car, you will not do it. So it has to be a total package.

My third challenge is the core structure of big-city government. Now, what I am going to say is going to sound hostile, and I do not mean for it to. I do not know how to say this without people being unhappy, but I will tell you bluntly, and I said the same thing to General Motors. If General Motors does not continue to go through a cultural revolution, they will disappear in the next 15 years, because the cultural model is wrong. They cannot compete with Toyota. They cannot even compete with Ford and Chrysler if Ford and Chrysler made the transformation and they do not.

I am a disciple of Edwards Deming. I believe in what he taught the Japanese. And, remember, Deming is an American. We are not asking anybody to become a Shinto believer. We are not asking anybody to study Confucius. We are not asking anybody to eat rice and fish as a diet.

Quality was invented by Schuhart at AT&T in the 1920's. It was taught by Deming in the 1950's to the Japanese,

and by Juran and others. It is an American concept of productivity taught by Americans, and Deming is 92 years old and lives near here. He would be thrilled to be invited someday by the Black Caucus to spend a half-day with them.

This is a man who transformed Japan. He is, frankly, a curmudgeon. He is pretty crusty. He thinks, at 92, he knows and we do not. He likes us to listen and he talks. Some of his ideas are not totally what I believe in.

But when you sit at the feet of history, and you realize that over a 50-year period, he has changed an entire country and, as a patriot, he is working desperately to change our country, it is a pretty amazing moment. I spent 7½ hours with him the day after Thanksgiving. At 92 years of age, he teaches a 4-day, 10-hour seminar, and when I take Deming's concept of quality and I apply it to any big city government in America, it fails totally. It is simply a disgrace to the taxpayer.

But let me show you how untraditional I am as a conservative. A great failure of big city bureaucracy and big city welfare state is not what it costs the middle-class taxpayer. The great tragedy is what it costs the human being who does not get the goods and services at the bottom of the ladder. The great tragedy when a school does not work is not my children and I working to pay taxes to subsidize the failed school, the great cost is the children who walk in in September to a building we know will fail, who walk out in May having been failed. And they are the ones who will pay with their lives, because we have not had the courage.

One brief aside: I once had dinner with Curtis LeMay. He was in his eighties at the time. LeMay said, and we spent 5 hours talking about World War II and what he had done, and LeMay said the reason people thought he was ruthless was when he was in command in England for about 6 months, he realized one day that a good friend of his had been failing and that he, LeMay, had not replaced that man because he just could not turn to his friend and say, "You have trained all of your life. You have risen to be a general, and you have to go home and take on a training command, because you are incompetent to lead a combat unit." And LeMay said what got to the core of his heart was that several hundred young men had died because, as a commanding general, LeMay had not had the moral courage to look that friend in the face and say, "You have failed." And he said that the rest of his career when he faced the tough decisions and he said, "Do I look rough and ruthless to my friends, or do I kill young men," he never, ever again chose killing young men as the way out.

Now, let me say the same thing about big cities. I do not have anything

personally against any mayor in America. I do not know most of them. I have a good friend who is the mayor of Atlanta, the last two mayors of Atlanta, who as you know alternate, and I do not know what Andy is going to do next, but Andy and Maynard have both been friends of mine. I think they are both very smart men. They both make a lot of money when they are in the private sector. They are both doing fine.

My problem is with the system, not with individuals. It is with the system.

Now, let me show you what got me to believe that. I terrified my friends on this side of the aisle who want to go home later on today, because I brought these books, and I want to assure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget I will not read all of these.

These three volumes are a report done by Governor Tom Kean on the schools of Jersey City. Governor Tom Kean is regarded by many as a moderate Republican, and by some even potentially as a liberal Republican, although I deny that, because there are no liberal Republicans. But he is a man who cares passionately about the poor. He is a man who got over 60 percent of the black vote when he ran for election, and he is a man who worked hard to revolutionize politics in his State to bring everybody into the 21st century.

When you read these reports, and I have read large chunks of these reports while he was still governor. It is part of what made me a revolutionary. You discover, for example, that in Jersey City the machine was using school district jobs as patronage. They had one \$54,000-a-year inspector of fire equipment who had not been to work in 2½ years, because the machine said he got the job because he is politically important, do not bother him, so there were high schools, and this is not GINGRICH, this is not a rightwinger from Georgia picking on New Jersey, this is the Governor's report on Jersey City schools. There were high schools which had second floor fire extinguishers that had no good chemicals, because for 2½ years this guy had taken \$54,000 a year, robbed the people, robbed the poor, robbed the children, and he was endangering their lives.

This is not a random act. All of you know it is not random. You know that all through the core structure of our cities, just as in some of our greatest industrial corporations, there are self-serving bureaucracies that no longer force themselves to behave ethically toward the very people they are supposed to take care of.

Now, I sense from your side that we could have a good dialogue, and I am not going to do what I was tempted to do. I have article after article, not out of Reader's Digest, which has the most devastating recent article on how the unions stole the Big Apple in January,

not out of Reader's Digest, out of the New York Times, out of various New Jersey publications, proof over and over of the systemic collapse. I am not going to try to spend time on that, because I do not think it is worthy of this dialogue. I may come some night and do a special order or two.

What I would rather do is close with this thought, and I have tried to keep this at a very analytical level: First, we have to take moral responsibility for every poor person in this country, all of us, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, Member of the Congress, member of the executive branch, and we have to confess we have been failing. The failure is obvious, and I will be glad to have any citizen of any background who wants to challenge me, I will take them into part of Atlanta, part of Oakland, part of Philadelphia, part of Washington. How can you not say we have been failing? How could you watch any evening, any two evenings of television news for any major metropolitan area and not say to yourself, "This country is not succeeding the way I want it to"? I stipulate that.

Second, I believe the failure begins with our stove-piping the problems instead of putting them all in one room and dealing with them as a holistic unit.

Third, I believe there is a core philosophical argument we have to talk out, because I believe until those who love the poor and care the most about the poor are prepared to adopt a model that accelerates the development of wealth and that accelerates the development of real income among the poor and accelerates the creation of jobs, we are not going to get there.

Socialism does not work as a model, because it is aberrant to the way humans work. We are stuck. It may not be a good system, and it may not be an ideal system, but we are stuck with some form of capitalism in the Adam Smith sense, because it seems to be the only system over time which tends to work.

Lastly, no model will work until we have the moral courage to address the core structural problems of big-city systems.

□ 1140

By the way, I apply that right down the street here. I not only think that Mayor Dinkins has to redefine New York City government. I think President Bush has to redefine the Federal Government. I think almost everything I am saying about the bureaucratic inertia and the waste and the ineffectiveness of cities is represented to a smaller extent in terms of what is happening over there.

So I appreciate the patience and the attention and the sense of interest and dialog. I will be glad to yield some time and have a dialog, if that is appro-

prate. I do not want to cut the gentleman off. I know he has a number of important speakers.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. First, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me just say I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has come to the floor of this body to engage the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus on this budget. That it seems to me is to the gentleman's credit.

I have often said that if we are prepared to come to this body intellectually honest, irrespective of our ideological positions, at least we can start to engage each other where we have legitimate differences and where we have agreements; so I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is here.

Let me just start with the gentleman's latter point about big cities. Someone much older and much wiser than this gentleman has said that all politics are local, because at some point all politics manifest themselves at the local level; so whatever we do at the Federal level, at some point reflects itself at the local level.

The problems of poverty, unemployment, and homelessness and inadequate education, housing, et cetera, manifest themselves at the local level. The gentleman and I both know that over the past 10 or 12 years specifically we have engaged in major draconian cutbacks in Federal services which has reflected itself at the local level, but we have never reduced the tax burden. We simply said that the Federal Government is not going to spend as much money on education. The Federal Government is not going to spend as much money on housing. The Federal Government is not going to spend as much money in a variety of different areas because, one, we are busy building up the military budget, and two, we are busy reducing the deficit.

So what happened? Those problems continue to be there, so we placed the tax burden not on the Federal level, we reduced it and placed it at the State and local level.

So a number of the issues that the gentleman raises simply are manifestations of shifting the tax burden, shifting the finance burden, when the problems continue to manifest themselves. So a number of our cities have begun to deteriorate, not because of their mismanagement, but because they lack the necessary resources to address the problems at the local level where people are feeling the pain.

So if, indeed, you are the mayor of a city attempting to address the problems of poverty, unemployment, homelessness, drug addiction, and violence,

and the Federal Government has withdrawn from a major commitment, I do not care how bright and eloquent and articulate with whatever management style you have, lacking the resources from the Federal Government is not going to look well.

Second, when you mention socialism versus capitalism, that is a discussion we could have, but in this budget we have placed before you a trillion-plus dollar budget for this entire country.

We have said, for example, throughout this budget that we are spending on jobs that solve real problems.

As a matter of fact, I said in very specific terms that the way to generate employment is to commit yourself to solving other kinds of problems, and in that regard you will indeed generate employment.

Second, and specifically in this budget, we placed \$3 billion in economic conversion, a large portion of it going to small business to assist in that economic conversion, with new technology development and efforts to stimulate them into developing research that would eventually generate technology that would enhance the quality of life.

And finally, very specifically in this budget, we place \$723 million over and above current spending that specifically is focused on minority business development, which goes to the question of entrepreneurship that the gentleman raised.

The third point I want to make is on this issue of an integrated approach. We totally agree with the gentleman on that. We have been saying in the past that a number of our problems are symptomatic of the tragic nature of the priorities of this country. The gentleman is absolutely right. You cannot deal with the problems of drugs in a vacuum, because the problem of drugs is a problem that is multifaceted. You have to deal with the economic implication, the political implication, the health implication, et cetera, so the gentleman is absolutely correct.

What we attempt to do in this budget is to take that aggregate approach and say let us begin to address all of the problems of this country, because many of them have gone begging as we decided to spend the Soviet Union into oblivion with a massive military budget buildup.

Let us for the sake of this discussion give President Reagan the benefit of that. Let us say, "OK. You spent the Soviet Union into oblivion."

But the point of it is that we are going down the same rathole and that is what brings us to this moment, and since we won that cold war, since there is no Soviet Union, let us take those resources and begin to solve the problems of people that went begging in the past.

Finally, let me just take on a major part of the assumption, because it has been the guiding post of the economic

ideology of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle. Supply side economics, or what some of us euphemistically refer to as the trickle-down theory. It goes very simply. If you put a substantial amount of money into the hands of the business community and the wealthy in America, they will reinvest, expanding the industrial and economic base of the Nation, achieving new technologies, expanding in great areas which will generate employment, people will go to work, their lives will be radically changed.

So what happened over the past 12 years with supply-side economics and the trickle-down theory?

We put a lot of money through the tax system, through deregulation, into the hands of the corporate wealthy and to wealthy people in this country.

Did they expand the industrial base? No. The industrial base is on the decline.

Did we expand the economy? No, we did not.

What did they do with the money? They went to the stock market and started playing junk bond economics. They started playing paper economics. They started engaging in corporate takeovers. We did not expand the industrial base in this country and the money did not trickle down, because we did not employ more people.

Why are we in a recession at this point? Unless I am crazy, everybody in America understands that. So the wealthy did not expand the base. The wealthy went out there and got wealthier. The poor got poorer, and our middle class started to decline.

So while I understand the gentleman's point, I do not agree with supply side economics.

The theory upon which this entire budget is based is that what this economy desperately needs is a shocking important dose of Keynesian economics where we take the peace dividend from the military budget and invest it in this economy, which will generate employment, generate entrepreneurship, stimulate new technology development, and move this economy forward.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, because I think the gentleman from California is laboring under some misimpressions about what took place over the last 12 years.

The fact is that during the decade of the 1980's, this country did create 21 million jobs. The industrial base in this country did not decline. In fact, we had the same industrial base in this country that we had in 1950. That means not that we have as many people working in that industrial base, but that the industrial base itself is the same as it was 40 years ago.

What we have seen is the rise of entrepreneurial activity. We had an explosion of small business creation, of entrepreneurship during the 1980's, an absolute explosion. It was the biggest such creation in the history of mankind. Those businesses created the jobs in the society. That is where the 21 million jobs came from.

Now, 85 percent of all jobs that are created in this country are created in that entrepreneurial sector.

The gentleman says that had nothing to do with supply side economics, that supply side economics did not work. I would tell the gentleman that if we look at the tax cut of 1981, it worked magnificently; however, we loaded a few things on during the 1980's that have led to the present recession.

In 1983, we loaded on a massive increase in Social Security taxes. Most of the Congress voted for those Social Security taxes in order to bail out a bankrupt system that had been driven to bankruptcy by prolific spending practices in this Congress and elsewhere.

In 1986, we added to that tax burden again with the so-called Tax Reform Act, that in addition to cutting tax rates, which it did some of, also raised taxes on investments, such as the capital gains tax. In addition to that, it hit real estate, one of the principal industries in the country with a triple whammy.

□ 1150

It ended passive loss treatment. It did the capital gains destruction. And in addition it changed the depreciation schedules. It was a triple whammy against them.

Then, when we began to see the decline, including that of financial institutions as we undermined the real estate base in the late 1980's, as we saw that begin to pull down the economy that had been growing up until then, the greatest growth, the greatest peacetime expansion in the economy in the history of this country, as that began to deteriorate, what did we do in 1990? We raised taxes again.

Then finally we drove the economy over the brink, and that resulted in the present recession.

Now, it was the tax increases during the 1980's that brought about the recession, not the fact that you had supply-side economics that did not work. Supply-side economics worked just as we said it would; it brought down inflation, it brought down the impact of joblessness in this society by creating jobs and increasing productivity.

Now, it seems to me that that is a model then that ought to be looked at, and we ought to look at what caused that model to fail. What caused the model to fail is when we increased the taxes and thereby brought it down.

I would also suggest that, as the gentleman then turns around and suggests

that the solution for the 1990's is to go back to the system that got us in trouble by the early 1980's, and that is to take all of the money that you can possibly find anywhere in the Government and put it into Government programs.

We started that in the 1960's. That was the Lyndon Johnson Great Society model. Take all of the money that you can possibly find in society and dump it into social programs, dump it into Government spending, and somehow that will ultimately trickle down, I would say to the gentleman, to the local level and we would end up with a better society out of it.

The Great Society has proven to be a massive failure. We now have the academicians who have taken a look at the results of the Great Society and found that it is an absolutely massive failure.

Before we went into the Great Society, with the kinds of controls that we imposed on the Federal level, neighborhoods worked in most parts of the country. City neighborhoods were in fact vital. But with the Great Society, what we encouraged was political machines in the city to concentrate more and more power in the city hall and thereby drove out of their ability to survive the neighborhood structures.

We also, because of the expansion of welfare, managed to drive down the value of the American family, and the disintegration of the American family is seen by most practitioners across the country as being the single biggest problem that the cities face.

In fact, President Bush indicated the other day that a group of mayors went to see him, they came from all philosophies and from all political backgrounds, and they told him the one single thing that they agreed upon, all of these people, was that the city problems stem from the disintegration of the American family. And that is a problem that is, in large part, created by a welfare system that has said that you are better off not having a family together but are better off to have the family disintegrate and we will pay you for that disintegration.

Now, those are problems that were created by this idea that you can spend money at the Federal level and have it trickle down to the local level and have it work. The fact is one of the few places still working in the country today are the small communities across the country that have not been impacted by a lot of that Great Society behavior. And they are still working and they are still vital, and they are still places where people want to live.

What we need to have is a system that says we go back to the idea of community structure, much as the small towns, make it work in the cities and neighborhood structures and that you can do that best, I would say to the gentleman from California, by putting money in the hands of people who work and need it.

But the more we at the Federal level take money away from them and put it into the pockets of bureaucrats in the name of doing good, the more we impact upon the communities' ability to survive.

Mr. Chairman, that is my concern with the budget that you put forth. The budget that you have put forward is a budget designed to take virtually all of the savings we now are going to get out of defense and put it into domestic spending programs and some bureaucracy in Washington will decide how to spend. That is what happens on these programs, vast sums of money end up being peeled off by bureaucrats at the Federal, State, and local levels before it reaches the people who need the help. That is a Government problem that we now face after the Great Society.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman would yield, I respect the gentleman, but I think that latter argument is extremely disingenuous. While I think it is a good stump speech, I do not think it is appropriate on the floor where we are attempting to engage each other seriously and substantively. What our budget is—

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has indicated that it is disingenuous for me to talk about something from my philosophical point of view. I believe that is exactly what the gentleman's budget does. You know, I think I have the right to give my analysis. The gentleman has for some time given his analysis of it.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield further, what I am saying when I mentioned disingenuous, I am prepared to address the gentleman's arguments, when he said that we put money into the hands of a number of bureaucrats, that is the only specific focus point I was attempting to address, because in this budget we are not talking about financing bureaucrats.

What we are saying is that the American people are crying out for these problems to be solved.

Now, the corporations are not going to solve the educational problems of this country. That is high on the American people's list. If you are going to generate employment, you have to have a plan to do it.

Let me respond just quickly.

Mr. WALKER. Can I make a point very quickly on what the gentleman is saying? The fact is that all of this money will go through some bureaucracy. The fact is, when you look at the Great Society programs, we ended up with the Great Society spending about \$36,000 a year for every poor person in the country and only about \$12,000 of that was getting to the poor people. Now that means that somewhere along the line two-thirds of the money was being peeled off, it was being peeled off by bureaucracies and by people who were nonpoor. So, it seems to me there

is very clearly a case where Government expenditures make a big difference in all of this.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding further. Let me just make one focus point. Let us take the gentleman's argument to its logical extreme: For the past 10 years we have allocated about \$300 billion per year to the Pentagon. The gentleman never made that argument about bureaucrats spending that kind of money.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, yes, I did, oh, yes, I did.

Mr. DELLUMS. Not building B-2 bombers, building MX missiles, weapons we do not need and nuclear weapons that create great danger to the planet that any sane person would not want to develop?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time, I have indeed come to this floor and made those arguments.

Mr. DELLUMS. You joined me in stopping the B-2 bomber? The MX missile? The Trident submarine?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman wants to talk about particular programs. The philosophical point is, do I think bureaucrats waste money in the Pentagon? And I will tell you that, yes, I do, and I have made those arguments on the floor.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

First of all I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for the debate that I think he has begun, out of sincerity and respect for trying to establish some kind of dialog on the issues that confront this country, and in the very least I think he has approached it in a substantive manner and not just a partisan manner, and for that I thank him.

I do think some of the issues he raised are legitimate and need to be discussed. Certainly I think the issue of whether or not we focus on one room and recognize that these issues are all related, is extremely important in terms of trying to understand that these are not problems that can simply be focused on either in terms of just health care or just education or just crime or just this or that; that you have to look at these issues as a unit and how they affect families and how they affect working people and how they affect our society generally. I do not dispute that.

I think the core value issue is an area where, frankly, I really think the American people believe that we do want a productive society, we do want a society in which their children have a better life. But we also want a society which reaches out with compassion to those who cannot make it or who have not made it.

I mean, you cannot just simply move away from the problems that are there. People are being impacted in our cities, there are hungry children in our society, there are individuals who do not get sufficient health care, there are the homeless. You cannot walk away from that problem.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with the gentleman. Let me give you an example of how fundamentally different I think we are, though, on exactly the question of how do you help the poor.

The Atlanta Constitution in January asked in a South-wide poll, "Do you believe able-bodied adults who receive money from the Government should be required to work, including women with young children?" Among Southern blacks, as broken out in the poll, it was 82 to 11. Why? Because 82 percent of the community feel that creating a core cultural value of earning resources is a very, very important part of life.

Now, I would suggest to you that giving people money does not in the long run help them. It is better than starving, but in fact it is ethically and morally destructive and degrading and that going to some system of mandatory work requirement, including having day care which is part of the work requirement, would in fact be more helpful both financially, without taking a penny away which is currently going into the system, making sure that every person got at least as much as they are currently getting but integrating into that a work ethic requirement, would, I think, actually improve the quality of life and the quality of the cultural existence of the people you most want to help.

□ 1200

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I think the gentleman needs to visit some soup kitchens, and needs to visit some homeless shelters and talk to the people there. I have. We have had a subcommittee in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and I visited throughout the country, talked to the people there. That is the last place they want to be. It is the last place they want to be. They do want a job.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would ask my colleague, "So why can't we then move a system of mandatory work through the Congress?"

My point is I do not want to get into details today except to say to the gentleman, "That's the kind of structural reform that I think is unavoidably necessary and that I think we have to make."

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who I think has to leave in a minute. This will give him a chance to comment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia

[Mr. GINGRICH] for yielding, and I do not want to point fingers either, and I am not going to, but I would like to give my colleagues some of my views about the direction we are going, and one is in economics, and the other one is in defense of this country for which I served for about 21 years.

Mr. Chairman, I do take seriously my colleague's concerns, the concerns of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], of poverty. As he is well aware, in San Diego, in some parts of San Diego, like all the major cities, we do have soup kitchens with Father Joe and a lot of the areas that we need help with, and there are people down there that can work, but that have not worked, that do not have the opportunity to work, and I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], my friend, that those are the areas in which we need to work, like Jack Kemp's enterprise zones and HOPE programs where people can own their own homes and so on. But I am not going to get into that so much today.

Back a couple of years ago I went to Florida, and I helped Senator CONNIE MACK in a race, and in that race one of the defense companies paid their dividend in \$2 bills, and in a matter of 3 days the entire State of Florida was covered with \$2 bills, and I do not care if they are selling pizzas, or real estate, or cars, or soup kitchens. The dollar from those defense industries went into the economy of those States, and I think especially on the east coast and in my State, California, where we receive a large portion of those defense contracts, it is very critical, and I think that, when we take a look at what we want to do or what Congress is attempting to do by taking down the walls and changing defense spending over into discretionary spending, it would be economically unsound at the rate that I think in which this amendment is trying to do, although I do agree we can cut defense over a period of time. If we cut more than the \$50 billion, where is it going to come from?

I talked to Secretary Garrett and Secretary Cheney yesterday. We are already cutting 236,000 active duty personnel. Those additional cuts would come, not from the equipment that the gentleman is talking about, but the 49 percent, which is over 300,000 personnel, active duty military.

Now that person that is working is getting a paycheck. They are also paying their taxes, and at the same time one of the things that Congress is trying to do is look at a health care plan for everybody. If they are working and active in industry, they have a health benefit. They are also paying into the general fund, which is called taxes. If we fire them or let off this million folks, then we are exacerbating the same problem that Congress looked at just a month ago with the unemploy-

ment where we wanted to spend \$7.5 billion to either increase the deficit or increase taxes, and now we are already causing more of a problem.

So, when my colleagues say, "a peace dividend," in my opinion a lot of that dividend goes to pay people that are not working which enhances and/or creates more people in the soup kitchens instead of helping the problem, and getting us back, and getting America to work, and let alone the subcontracts that are affected, the pizza shops, the car dealers and the rest of it that are affected, and I think it would be disastrous.

Take a look all over the country, at Rohr, at General Dynamics and McDonnell Douglas and all the subcontractors that are affected. These are jobs. These are people that will not be going to the soup kitchen, and I will be happy to yield in just a moment, and I think it is important that, when we take a look at what put us into this recession and the big problems we are in right now, the 1986 tax bill which was a disaster for small business, the 1990 tax bill which increased taxes, and some of our liberal Republicans even voted for that rascal, which was a big mistake, but it has put us in a position right now that we are going to have a difficult time.

The S&L's, as my friend from California mentioned in his talk, has been a disaster. It is going to cost—we are talking about cutting \$50 billion. The S&L alone is going to cost \$500 billion, and the head of the GAO said that just last week in San Diego where estimates are up to \$1 trillion. I would love to use that in the programs the gentlemen are looking at right now.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, let me just do two things. First of all, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] by saying that he indicated he would like to sit down with the caucus, and we would welcome that, and I would look forward to arranging for us to have the dialog. I think that is very, very important, and we welcome it.

Let me also respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. As the gentleman knows, we talked about a trillion dollars in this budget. We are talking about this budget now, and this budget creates more jobs, and we are talking about in the military, talking about creating a GI bill that really works, that provides educational opportunities, that will make it possible for us to compete with those countries that we have a trade deficit with. This is the kind of thing this budget will do. This budget does not bring about pain. This budget eliminates pain.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "I think that the comments

that you have made, if you read this budget, I think that we can count on your vote."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that the pain it has caused is from the lack of jobs that we lose by cutting defense at that rate before we can have conversion over the civilian country, and I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], "If you look at the history in the last 6 months, I'm sure you've walked your precincts, just like I have. 20 percent of all of my shopping centers are empty, and those are jobs, because we have plants in San Diego like Rohr, like General Dynamics that are moving, like McD. that are going overseas for money, and what we want to do is take a look at when we cut defense over a period of time."

I am still not satisfied. I saw Yeltsin last week yelling, "You need to give me money or the Communists are going to take over." Well, we have patted ourselves on the back, and this will also give us the amount of time to see that—as the gentleman knows, that Wall has not been very long, and we need to take a look at how and what kind of a rate, and like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], my friend, mentioned, that it is the Pentagon's responsibility. I agree with that, and I would like to address that in the second part of my remarks.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I could make one comment to that?

Mr. GINGRICH. Very briefly.

Mr. DELLUMS. One comment on that:

In a "Dear Colleague" I sent out to my colleagues, I want to quote very briefly from that "Dear Colleague." We pointed out to our colleagues that in a recent study it showed that an annual average transfer of \$70.5 billion from the military budget to education, infrastructure and other critical needs would generate an annual net gain of nearly 577,000 jobs on an average over a 4-year period. Moreover, the GNP was shown to grow by an average of \$17.6 billion annually, and that is the basis upon which we have written this budget, to say, "If you invest in these programs, you generate employment, you reduce the deficit, you increase the GNP."

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield very briefly to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], my friend.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my friend. I say to him, "I didn't vote for the President's budget because it cut education so much, it increased taxes, and it increased spending. I don't think

that your amendment will pass. I think the A and B of the Democrat Party also increases spending and increases taxes, and I would ask my friend to have the same heart and not vote for the Democratic plan as well."

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to wrap up and yield back so that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] can have some of his people speak, and I appreciate his patience, but let me make a couple of quick points.

First, I think I do at one level disagree with my friends about the, quote, lack of resources at the local level, close quote. I would point out that New York City's personnel budget alone is \$13.3 billion. It is larger than the entire budget of 47 States. I would say, second, that in terms of helping the poor and in terms of food, the gentleman from California earlier made the comment about the number of things he had worked on with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON]. I would also note, I believe, there are 96 different Federal programs that relate to food, there are 96 different little bureaucracies, each with their own little zone, each with their own paperwork, each with their own regulations.

□ 1210

Third, I want to quote briefly from Vice President QUAYLE's speech last Thursday night to the Economic Club in New York. He said, and I quote:

As we seek our economic security in this uncertain world, we must learn what works and what doesn't. Let us look at this great city. It attests to what becomes of those who put their faith in the benevolence of the state. In what should be a liberal paradise, what do we find instead?

Honest, ambitious, hard-working New Yorkers struggling to pay the highest local taxes in America—about \$1,600 per person.

A business tax three times greater than that paid by businesses in Chicago and Los Angeles.

One in every eight people on the dole. Taxpayers investing \$7,000 a year for each public school student, compared to \$3,000 per student in private schools. The taxpayers' investment in education gets a high-school graduation rate of 38 percent. That means 62 percent don't finish on time.

Liberal economics may prevail here, but it sure doesn't work here. It's estimated that by 1994, a total of 320,000 private sector jobs will be lost in New York City. When the taxpayers meekly protest these high taxes, the liberal deep-thinkers snap back that we lack "compassion" for the working man. But the working man is usually the one most hurt by this kind of thinking. Now, I know: it's an election year. And I don't pretend to be entirely non-partisan. But ladies and gentlemen, I am not appealing to party affiliation. I'm appealing to reason and tragic experience: the liberal vision of a happy, productive, and content welfare state hasn't even worked on 22 square miles of the most valuable real estate in the world.

You don't build economic strength by taxing economic strength. If you tax wealth, you diminish wealth. If you diminish wealth, you diminish investment. The fewer the investments, the fewer jobs.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say in closing that I have three citations for

staff and for people who later on read this RECORD and for those watching on C-SPAN. First, "The Other Path—The Invisible Revolution of the Third World" by Hernando de Soto, probably the most powerful book on helping the poor written in the last 20 years. It is about Peru, but, frankly, it is about Miami or Washington, about Philadelphia or New York. And I would commend in particular the introductory foreword by Mario Vargas Llosa, which is a brilliant statement of why a lawyer-dominated bureaucratic welfare state fails.

Second, "City for Sale," by Jack Newfield and Wayne Barrett, an incredible book on the scale of corruption in New York.

And third, "New York Unbound, the City and Politics of the Future," by Peter Salins as the editor, which is an effort to apply new ideas and new approaches to saving New York, because the truth is that New York is our greatest city. We cannot afford as a country to let our cities die. Those who are conservative cannot walk off, and those who are liberal cannot just blindly defend.

We have to join together, and I look forward to working with my friend, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from California, arranging some meetings, with totally no holds barred and no records. Let us just erase the board and talk together. I thank the gentleman for the integrity, the intensity, and the sincerity he brings to what is a serious and deeply felt appeal to do better for the poor in America.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, first let me just say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my effort here is hopefully to try to bring us to a high level of discussion and debate. We have legitimate differences, and let us have our legitimate differences.

Our budget here is a first step down the road that I think will impact this Nation for at least the next 8 to 10 years. So this is a very important step. If we quibble with any of the details here, fine, but let us sit down and talk about it.

This is a broad outline for taking this country in a new direction. I understand we have philosophical differences, because one of the glaring points that needs to be made here when we start talking about welfare relates to the problems we are confronting right at this moment.

Our welfare rolls are expanding right now. Why are they expanding? Because IBM is laying off, the automobile industry is laying off, airlines are laying off, factories are closing, corporations are dwindling, and food stamps are expanding. All these things are happening because people do not have jobs. We do not have to be brilliant to under-

stand that when people do not have jobs, they are going to attempt to survive, and if there are programs out there to help them survive, they are going to move toward them.

If we want to reduce the welfare rolls, there is a very simple response: generate employment. I believe in the human spirit. I believe in the dignity of the human being. I think that when people are given an opportunity, they will want to work, they will want to get out there, but if we do not have any jobs out there for them, where are they going to go?

Our budget is designed to generate employment. That is the whole part of it.

Another major aspect of welfare is children. Are we going to put them out there?

We have to write a budget that speaks to expanding the economic infrastructure of this country.

If we generate employment, I will guarantee that the welfare rolls are going to go down and the deficit is going to go down if the GNP goes up.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I certainly want the gentleman to understand that I did not mean in any way to be disrespectful of him.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is the only difference we have, and I was not trying to get to the minutia of the budget. I was only trying to deal with the general philosophy of it. My only point is that the gentleman's way of achieving that is by having the money go through government agencies. I understand the gentleman sincerely believes that this is a way of doing good things, and I respect his opinion on that.

My philosophy tells me that if we want get those kinds of jobs in society, what we want to do is take the wealth that we have that is now being spent on other things and put that back by giving it to the people who work and invest in America rather than sending it through government agencies. That is the difference we have.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY].

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this has been an interesting debate so far. I think that this is a very necessary debate. This budget is a very necessary budget to come before this body at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] who, in concert with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], has crafted a budget that we think is doable, we think is credible,

and we think is full of integrity. I also want to thank the leadership which allowed, through the Committee on Rules, the time so we can have this debate. I also want to thank the members of the Budget Committee for allowing the range of options we are discussing today.

Just in dispute with some of the things said on the other side of the aisle just a minute ago with regard to this budget, that it is a job-killing budget, let me cite specifically that this particular budget, the CBC alternative authorizes an additional \$723 million in small business and minority business assistance through the SBA, because we all realize in looking at any study ever done that small business is the engine that creates jobs and growth in this country. Eighty percent of the jobs created in this country are created through small business defined as businesses employing 50 or fewer people. So we create jobs with this budget. There are a lot of things I would like to say in response to some of the things that the distinguished minority whip said with regard to welfare. I think that on this side of the aisle Members will find we are just as frustrated and disgusted with some of the current welfare applications as anyone else in this body, and there are specific means to try to combat that in this CBC alternative budget and in the Democratic budget resolution, to try some innovative things to help people develop assets to get away from just a consumption-based theory.

But I am not going to speak about that in specifics. I want to turn my attention to the overall aspects of this particular CBC alternative and progressive budget.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said many times yesterday that a budget is not just about numbers, but a budget is more fundamentally about people. I would submit to my colleagues that among all the budgets discussed on yesterday, the Gradison budget, the Bush budget—which failed, and understandably so—and then the Democratic budget resolution, both A and B, of all the budgets discussed and which will be discussed today, this alternative budget, this progressive budget, Mr. Chairman, is the one that does the most for people.

□ 1220

I guess you can all it budget C, and that C stands for choices, and that C stands for challenges.

The choices we make will determine the quality of education that our children will receive. The choice that we will make is the pace at which our economy will rebound and recover. Challenges to, frankly, the quality of life, improving that quality of life for those who live in our inner cities and those who live in our rural areas.

So, Mr. Chairman, this budget is the C budget, the choice budget, the challenge budget, and the choices we make will determine if this American dream will be restored for millions in our country, or if this growing national nightmare will only grow darker and more ominous for many among us.

Now more than ever before the American people are demanding, Mr. Chairman, that we take care of them at home. Why?

If you look at what happened in the Soviet Union, we can look on a remarkable chain of events. The Soviet people rose up and demanded change from a system that they determined is an indigenous system that was old and tired, spent, and wasting inordinate amounts of their GNP on weapons and weapons systems and old tired notions of military dominance.

Over there in the Soviet Union the people said to their leaders, they said, "Hey, we got some great bombs, but what about bread? And, yes, we have troops stationed throughout Eastern Europe, but we are trooping on to economic disaster. And about our invasion of Afghanistan, why did we go there? Why did we do that? That is unjust, that is immoral, that is unwise, and that is inappropriate. Why don't we refocus more of our GNP on economic security, on prosperity, on hope and happiness and jobs in our own system that create some real wages and an ability to live?"

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the people over there were just simply saying to their government and to its leaders, what about us?

Well, in our country our people are beginning to ask the same old question. What about us? In election after election the American people have been sending messages that we must begin to heed. They are tired of seeing their communities wither and die. They are tired of seeing jobs go overseas. They are tired of the violence and drugs in our inner cities and our rural areas. They are tired of schools that do not educate their children, and they are tired of an out-of-control health care system that leaves 40 million Americans without the ability to see a doctor.

They do not know we have to have 1 out of every 10 Americans on food stamps. Just as our distinguished colleague said from California, the food stamp rolls are increasing. They are increasing. We do not have to have one out of every five children in our country in poverty. We do not have to have millions of our people wandering around our cities like vagabonds. We do not have to have dilapidated shacks and housing in districts like mine, where 30 percent of the folks still lack plumbing. Where in America in 1992 some still have to get rain water from culverts. Some have to take rusty buckets and go to a stream 6 or 7 miles

away and drop that bucket into a muddy stream just to get water to take home to try to purify to wash their teeth so the children can go to school in the morning.

I think that we have a better Nation than that. So this particular budget allows us to transfer some funds from an old system in another world and another day, and transfer these much needed funds we think to much better goals.

Most of all, Mr. Chairman, our people are tired of a government which is either unable or unwilling to make the changes required to meet the serious challenges that we face. They are tired of our Nation being paralyzed by the mistakes and captured by the debates of the past. They want bold action to address the problems we face today, and to secure our country's future.

So, Mr. Chairman, this budget for new world realities, as we call it, represents that bold action. This budget is not being presented just for rhetorical purposes only. I only would like our colleagues to take time to read this budget. It took a lot of time for the gentleman from California to help to fashion this budget, along with the entire Progressive Caucus and Black Caucus. It is a reasonable budget. It is a doable budget. It is a credible budget. It is a budget that is full of integrity, and I think one that every Member of this body should take very seriously.

But most of all, this budget for new world realities reflects a crucial need to change our priorities, to change our thinking and our spending in line with the new realities which confront us in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, for the last 40 years our national policy and our budget has been set and has been focused on one undergirding, overriding proposition, and it has been said before in debate. That proposition was that the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is clear today that the Russians are no longer coming, but the Japanese, the Germans, the South Koreans, and our other economic competitors are already here.

The cold war is over and we have won, but our celebration is muted because our Nation has paid a bitter price for that victory. The cold war's victims are the homeless on our streets, the unfed or the underfed children in our families, the sick, the disabled, the elderly left without access to affordable health care, and the deteriorating infrastructure of a nation that has lost a major share of the commercial markets in the world, markets that we must regain.

The cold war's victims are working and middle-income taxpayers, whose taxes have been increased to pay the burden of defending the free world, while wealthy Americans who have benefited most from the defense buildup have paid less and less.

So now that the post-World War II era is over, the question our Nation faces is will we change our priorities sufficiently to meet these new world realities? Or will we remain wedded, like an estranged marriage, to policies of the past, and, in the process, sacrifice our future?

The budget from the other side of the aisle I believe really does not take into account the full scope of the unprecedented changes in the world. I believe, to this gentleman, their budgets just continue to pretend that the pain and suffering being endured by millions of Americans today does not demand any kind of a bold response. The budget presented by those on the other side of the aisle would continue to disarm our economy, continue to disinvest in America, and I believe continue to take us down the road to ruin.

So the committee budget, which I also support, takes an important step in the right direction. It recognizes the new realities in the world, and it recognizes and begins to recognize the growing needs that we have here at home.

But, Mr. Chairman, this budget that we speak of today continues further down that road. It goes even further in the right direction. It does make deeper cuts in defense spending than those proposed by the House Committee on Armed Services. It makes deeper reductions. But in the view of this gentleman, not unrealistic reductions.

For fiscal year 1993 it retains \$239 billion for defense. I think that that is certainly an adequate amount to ensure our Nation's security, especially in this radically changing world.

Overall, the CBC and Progressive budget saves \$50 billion in budget authority and \$21 billion in defense outlays for fiscal year 1993. Now, that is a real peace dividend that the American people deserve and that our country deserves.

Mr. Chairman, it does so while providing funding to help military families and the communities which are undergoing a transition as a result of these defense cuts. It provides \$8 billion for a severance, pension, and job training package for released military personnel. It provides \$3 billion in defense savings for investment in plant restructuring, retooling, job training and income support for communities in transition. And it provides \$3.25 billion to reform veteran services.

By realizing this peace dividend, our budget will allow the Nation to invest more in education, more in jobs, and in our infrastructure.

This is a time when we realize that the middle income folks are being hurt. The cost of a college education is out of reach. This budget would provide an additional \$2.5 billion increase over fiscal year 1992 spending, adjusted for inflation.

When millions of young people are unemployed and unemployable, this

budget would provide a \$2 billion increase for the Job Training Partnership Act and Job Corps, which is a proven program, like the WIC Program and like Head Start, which saves young lives, and which is cost effective, because it saves \$1.46 for every dollar that we spend.

Mr. Chairman, when only 31 percent of the children eligible for Head Start are actually enrolled, this budget would increase Head Start by \$2.1 billion and give thousands more children the early childhood education they need to escape poverty. So with this budget, this is the only budget that will fully fund Head Start by 1995.

Mr. Chairman, I could stand here another 5 minutes, and I will not. I will just say it just comes down to this: in Mississippi there is a story we are fond of telling about a smart-alecky kid who thought he could fool an old blind man.

So he went to a bush and he found a bird. And he thought he would play a joke on the blind man. He said, "Blind man, blind man, tell me: this bird in my hand, is it alive or is it dead?"

□ 1230

You see, he thought it was a good joke in any fashion, because if the blind man had said, "Old boy, that bird is alive," he had planned to crush it between his two hands and kill it. If he had said, "Old boy, that bird is dead," he had planned to open his hands and let it fly away. In any response he would have had a good joke, he thought. But in addition to that man being blind, he was also very wise, because he said, "My son, my son, the answer is in your hands."

I could say the same thing to my colleagues today. The President stood here just a few months ago, up here, and drew a line in the sand with regard to reductions in the defense budget. He said, "\$50 billion by the next 5 years, this low and no lower." I tell my colleagues, that is a line in the sand that we must cross. I think the American public deserves us to cross it, and they in fact want us to cross it.

We cannot continue to spend away our future by running massive deficits. That is true. But neither can we continue to neglect our future by refusing to make the investments in our people, in our economy, in our infrastructure that allows us to move into a new and challenging future.

I would just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying we can no longer afford not to take care of our needs at home. Every day we delay only means that the eventual costs in money, but most importantly in pain for our citizens, will be that much more.

For the past 40 years our Nation has devoted the lion's share of our energy and resources to meeting the challenge that we face from abroad. Now is the time to meet the challenges that we

face at home. So the question before this House today, in considering this alternative budget, is not whether we can afford to transfer more funds from defense to domestic needs. The question really, and more importantly, is we cannot afford not to do it.

I say to my colleagues today, we have one budget that we dismissed yesterday. We have the Budget Committee alternative A and B, but this is budget C. I just say to my colleagues, "The answer is in your hands."

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY]. I have enjoyed listening to him. I agree with him on many points, that we do need to create jobs, but I would disagree on one point. I do not think the Soviet Union and the people rose up because there was increased spending on defense. To my knowledge they rose up to fight against communism. They rose up because they do not have the freedoms that we enjoy.

The defense system in the United States is about one one-hundredths of the Soviet Union's. The defense now in this country is smaller than when Pearl Harbor was bombed, and the President is attempting to reduce that even more and take a look at economic conversion over a long period of time.

I think instead, as I addressed in the first portion of this talk, that we need to attack the other end of the horse, what got us here and what cut the jobs in the first place, things like the 1986 tax bill where we raised taxes, and eliminated preferential treatment for capital gains; the 1990 tax bill, which most of the conservative Republicans voted against, but it still was a disaster; and the S&L debacle, which if it costs us \$500 billion, I am sure we could increase jobs and do a lot of the same things we could without cutting the defense of this country and the support, and we need to take a look over a long period of time.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the minority whip, said that the defense cuts and the missions were really in the hands of the Pentagon. I agree with that. I spent a large portion of my life in the military. I was on the Seventh Fleet staff. I worked on the Sixth Fleet staff for the defense of not only the Middle East but all of the Southeast Asia countries. I have flown everything that is in the U.S. inventory and most of the things that are in the Soviet inventory.

When it comes to cuts in defense and their impact, and from working in OP O-5, which is APN, Procurement, I have a background. But people like Schwarzkopf and the admirals and generals that are there have a much more broad knowledge of what our needs are than myself.

Let me give you a perspective from my view. It is that I not only flew combat in Vietnam but I flew in Israel, as well, and I know what the requirements are of our military men and women. I talked to the economy before, but now I would like to talk about the defense of this country as I see it and what is important.

When I flew in Vietnam I was not flying against the Soviet Union. When we flew in Korea we were not flying against the Soviet Union. When we flew in Desert Storm we were not flying against the Soviet Union, or acting in a military operation against the Soviet Union. But we were fighting Soviet technology, Soviet equipment, French equipment, U.S. equipment on the other side that even our own country had given to the enemy, and those technologies and the threat of nuclear weapons of other countries that aided and abetted the countries that are potential enemies.

That is another area I think we need to take a look at. That is why I do not support selling F-15's to the Middle East right now, because I think if either side increases those expenditures it could be devastating as well.

I also do not support any country that is developing nuclear weapons. I think we need to reduce our nuclear weapons inventory and balance it with what the former Soviet Union and what the Republics are doing, and to cut those things that are a threat.

That is why in your budget when I look at SDI, I can remember the Scud missiles coming in at Israel. I do not want, my friend from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and I am sure you do not, we do not want missiles someday coming in at the State of California or any other great State and not have the capability to defend against it. Because if people are in a soup kitchen or in a mansion, it is not going to make any difference where that weapon is going to hit. I do feel SDI in this budget is very critical and these are things we need to take a look at.

I also think Third World countries are not going to send a missile at us. They are going to park a tanker in San Diego Harbor, L.A. Harbor, or New York Harbor and explode it, just to send a message. We need to defend somehow against that. I do not know how you do that, other than retaining a strong national defense.

I know for every \$1 billion in defense spending, we create about 40,000 jobs. It is important as well to us. I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my good friend, to come down to San Diego to NAS Miramar, and I will take you through the Top Gun School, through the adversary schools where we train our pilots. The reason I want you to do that, my friend, is that I want to show you kids and professionals that are sitting doing nothing because they do not have the fuel to fly.

We want a smaller force, we want a readiness force, and we want it well equipped. Right now they are not flying. They are having to fly what we call an FFRP, a Fleet Fighter Readiness Program, from San Diego instead of deploying, because they do not have the temporary duty money to deploy the squadrons to do it. Instead, we are having to spend \$150,000 flying airplanes because we cannot afford \$25 a day for TAD funding for housing. That is an interim program that we have to solve there, too.

What I am saying is we need to run the military more like business, and we need to run the Congress more like business. Those are areas that I think we can save and help with.

Right now, with the current defense cut of \$50 billion that the President wants to look at, we are having to build an airplane or look at an airplane, the F-18E/F, that is less capable than an airplane that we already have today, and will be better than an airplane that we have in the year 2010. The F-14 could go faster, it can drop more bombs, it has a better weapons system, but even today, last session, we cut the requirements to add to the F-14 system. We cannot even shoot the current missile inventory that we have with that. We cannot even fire the weapons we have created today without weapons systems, whereas with the F-18 radar we can shoot a missile further than the radar will see, because of budgetary constraints.

What I am saying is that when we look at defense and those cuts, we need to be very picky. There are some areas that all of us support in cutting in defense, but we also have to take a look at what the real threat is. I remember Yeltsin just last week saying, "The Communists are coming, the Communists are coming again. You need to give us money." If that is the case, if we cut everything right now, my friend, I think we are going to be in sad shape.

If we look at the AX and the F-22, and I do not have the time to go into those things, we will debate on our committee, but I think that those are areas that are of serious concern to me in defense.

I would ask my friends from the other side of the aisle that when we take a look at the real problems in the country, and we are trying to create jobs, let us get a banking bill out of this Congress. Between now and the election, we are at an impasse. We cannot solve these problems with the banking bill we passed.

We passed the weakest possible crime bill.

I would ask on these things, just like when we are talking about inner cities and keeping people out of welfare and soup kitchens that are on drugs, let us pass one of the drug bills of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON];

for example, as in our own Post Office, with our own employees and our own Congressmen. Those things fail.

□ 1240

So I support a lot of the things that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle has offered, the A and B plan. I do not think the C budget will pass. But I would ask Members to take a serious look at the Democratic proposal because I think it does increase taxes, increases spending, and has some of the same problems that the 1986 and 1990 bill did.

I ask my friends from the other side of the aisle not to support those.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, today we are discussing the budget proposal brought to us by the Black Caucus. It is one of the alternatives that we have in the budget proposals that we are considering yesterday and today.

I did not yesterday have a chance to direct my remarks, because of the time limitations, to the proposal put forward by the majority on the Budget Committee. Thus, most of my remarks today are directed to that and to the alternative that is contained in the President's budget proposal. But I think the comments that I make are really very much apropos to the proposal that we are considering in this debate, because this is really a matter of establishing some priorities.

As I look at the proposal that we have from the budget majority, and I serve on that committee, it looks a little bit like going to a restaurant and ordering dinner. Just as the waiter comes up and gives you the specials for the day, and tells you what the soup du jour is, we are hearing today that we have a budget du jour, a budget special. This is a little bit unusual, this majority resolution that we have been considering. It is very unusual for a budget resolution. In fact, as far as I can determine, it is the first of its kind that has ever been offered. And of course, the reason we are seeing it is because there is an unwillingness on the part of the Democrat majority to take responsibility, to give the House a definitive recommendation about what we ought to do about the fire walls or the budget caps. Or if we move the metaphor from the restaurant to the football field, I think we can safely say that the majority punted in this case.

Why should a budget resolution approved by the majority, brought to this floor by the majority be any different than a crime bill or the Family and Medical Leave Act? In that case the Judiciary Committee and the Education and Labor Committee had no difficulty asking members to express a preference for one approach or the other in the committee. These commit-

tees had no difficulty presenting the House with a single bill. Of course, the Rules Committee always has an option to provide for the consideration of alternative substitutes or of amendments. That is the way the process works. We were elected to Congress to make some choices, yes, Mr. Chairman, some tough choices, not to avoid them.

The Republicans on the Budget Committee urged that we separate or divide the question between plan A and plan B—plan B to keep the firewalls, plan A to take them down—during markup in the Budget Committee. But the majority refused to do that, refused to even State a preference for whether we should keep the caps or not.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is a sad day for leadership in this body when we cloak it in that kind of irresolute behavior. So what do we have in the schizophrenic resolution that comes to us from the majority? We have two different budget blueprints, plan A, which will spend the peace dividend as though it is some kind of free money, and plan B that would keep the budget caps and apply the savings to the deficit. So we have the fire walls, as they are called, up, and we have the fire walls down.

The choice between the two budgets depends on a vague, and some would say impossible, prospect that we might enact a separate bill to modify the current law that prohibits shifting money, at least in the coming fiscal year, from defense cuts to domestic spending. But it gets worse than that, because Chairman ASPIN, from the Armed Services Committee, suggested four different defense options, A, B, C, and D. No decision there either for the House. And so if my probability theory is correct, if I remember correctly from my days of taking statistic in school, we are up to eight different scenarios, eight possible budgets. And if we keep going in this direction, pretty soon we could have enough permutations in the budget for every man, woman and child to have his or her own budget. Take your pick. Satisfy anyone or satisfy everyone.

Mr. Chairman, that is not leadership. I went on record a long time ago saying that the budget caps ought to be retained, and defense savings ought to be used to reduce the budget deficit, period. The most important domestic agenda for this country has to come from budget discipline, not from new spending.

So that is what this debate today and yesterday on all of these alternatives really is about, leadership and some discipline. It is no wonder we find that the President saying he made a mistake in agreeing to the 1990 budget summit. He thought he made a deal. But the majority seems to have a different idea of what a deal is. Their idea is what is ours stays in, but your positions adopted in the budget summit are open for renegotiation at any time.

The Budget Committee majority failed miserably when it came to exercising discipline. Consider just a few of the following:

Item: During markup, the Democrats rejected amendments that would have offered more than \$15 billion in deficit reduction in fiscal year 1993.

Item: The budget majority rejected the President's entitlement savings outright, and amendments offered to slow entitlement spending while offering none of their own, even after talking a good game about the importance of entitlement restraint in a report issued by the committee only 2 months ago. The report is entitled "Restoring America's Future: Preparing the Nation for the 21st Century." Let me quote just one sentence from that report. "The concept of an entitlement cost cap is strongly endorsed by the committee." But no such cap will be found here.

Item: They rejected amendments to means test entitlements for the wealthy while just hours before, on the same day they claimed victory on an economic growth package taxing the so-called rich.

Item: The budget majority rejected recommending hard defense numbers, offering, as I suggested earlier, a potpourri of choices, A, B, C, D defense plans. More avoidance of decisionmaking.

Item: When it came to reducing the foreign aid account by \$3.2 billion, a responsible, a well-thought-out reduction that would have kept the aid for our vital national security areas, but would have reduced it from the wasteful programs. That too was rejected.

Is it any wonder we are facing a \$399 billion deficit this year? It was only 1½ years ago that the Budget Enforcement Act was enacted into law. Now, as fast as you can say the word spend, there are Members advocating tearing down the firewalls that separate discretionary categories so that they can spend an illusory peace dividend on domestic investments. It is as though you have a \$5,000 credit card debt and only \$100 a month to start paying it off. Then one month your take home pay goes up by \$25. Any prudent person would use that \$25 to pay down the whopping debt that he or she has. But not the majority on the Budget Committee, not under option A. No; they would consider that new money, free money, and they are going to spend it.

We have an obligation in this House to stop this addictive behavior, to stop this compulsive spending, to make real efforts to reduce our Federal budget deficit. Defense savings should be directed toward deficit reduction, not new Federal spending. Mandatory and entitlement spending, which accounts for nearly two-thirds of all of our spending, must be reigned in. No amount of defense or discretionary domestic cuts will balance the budget,

and our discretionary account should not increase above the spending caps. That is just an open invitation to make the deficit worse and worse.

I oppose the alternative that we are considering here today because of the damage it would do to our national defense. I oppose the majority's budget resolution which we will vote on later.

□ 1250

I am only sorry that the committee that I serve on could not have assumed a leadership role and presented the House with a blueprint for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's remarks, and I just want to specifically focus on his statement about leadership, because, you know, the gentleman indicated earlier that he was not going to specifically speak to the proposal before the body now which is the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget, but, rather, to the other budget.

I am simply saying that we have attempted to assert leadership. The gentleman may respectfully disagree, and I respect that, because that is what this process is all about, the give and take of different ideas, but I think the gentleman must agree that we attempted to assert some leadership. We stepped out there. You know, we did not have option A, B, C, D, E, F, G. We said this is the nature of the world as we perceive it. These are the solutions that we perceive. We put together a document here, and we put it in everybody's hands, 435 Members of Congress, and we said that we are prepared to debate it in the full light of day for 8 hours.

The President did not even want you guys to bring his budget up for 8 hours, and that is not a partisan statement. That is just a factual statement. So I think we have assumed some leadership here by saying we will not only put these ideas out here, we will expose them to the full light of public discussion.

I think the gentleman has had to admit, whether he agrees with us or not, that he cannot lump us into not assuming leadership, because we stand here prepared to assume leadership, and I think we have asserted leadership.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement. I would be happy to concede that. While I do not agree with his proposal, what the gentleman has done has been to bring a substantive proposal, well thought out. But the priorities may be all wrong as far as I am concerned.

Mr. DELLUMS. I respect that.

Mr. KOLBE. It is a well-thought-out proposal that deserves to be considered

and debated. However, the gentleman and I know that the underlying budget we are going to consider here today that came out from the committee that I serve on is the one that is ultimately going to be the budget of the House of Representatives. That is why I directed my remarks there, but I congratulate my friend and colleague from California for taking leadership and proposing a budget that at least gets us into an intellectual discussion, particularly in the area of defense, as to where our spending priorities should be.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have a number of speakers who wish to speak about the CBC budget, and we will be proceeding in short order to them.

I want to take a few moments, before we do that, to thank the people who have brought this budget forward, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], for the leadership he has provided and, of course, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who serves on the Committee on Armed Services, who has done the bulk of the work in pulling together the CBC budget, and to pull together an entire budget for this Nation is an immense technical challenge, and for that alone I think these two Members deserve to be congratulated.

But I think more importantly, they deserve to be congratulated for the political courage that they have shown by pulling together this budget, and I say political courage, because they have chosen to do something that has only been dreamed about in this country for over a decade.

We all talked about a peace dividend. In fact, we have talked about it for at least 10 years in this country, and we all agree there will be some peace dividend now. In fact, the President of the United States came to us and stood on the floor of this Congress and said that he was prepared to offer defense cuts of approximately \$10 billion a year, about \$50 billion over the time period that he was examining for us, and that seemed like a lot to the people who were listening. To most of America, it seemed like a significant sum of money.

Unfortunately, that is not enough to address the problems that we have had grow immensely in this country over the last 10 years. It is not enough to provide health care for the 40 million Americans who may work for a living who have no access to health care. It is not enough to take care of the homeless population of this country, one-third of whom, I might mention, are veterans who have served this country in overseas conflicts. It is not enough to take care of the hungry population of this country, a population that barely existed 10 years ago.

So what we have developed as an alternative is the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget, a budget that proposes not \$50 billion in military savings until the end of the century but an astounding \$1 trillion in military savings.

Some people may think that \$1 trillion is much too much to ask for, that it is too good to be true, that it is an unrealistic proposition, but I think once you begin to examine how the military budget has been driven over the years, you begin to see that it is not only feasible, it is practical.

The military budget in this country has been driven by the Soviet threat. It has been driven by the fact that we needed to contain communism. In fact, this has been the central tenet of American foreign policy since World War II.

Yesterday, in the Committee on Rules, we had speakers who referred to the fact that it has been a bipartisan philosophy that as far back as President Carter we have had Presidents pushing a huge defense buildup to meet the Soviet threat and to put pressure on the Soviet system. Well, regardless of how it has happened or why it has happened, the pressure did exist on the Soviet system. Some say that our spending forced the Soviets over the edge.

Mr. Chairman, that may very well be true, because it is obvious that dramatic changes have occurred in the world, but there is no need for us to follow the Soviets over the edge.

I had the opportunity to go to visit the Soviet Union right before the glasnost and perestroika became daily words in the Soviet system. One thing that I noted was but for the defense establishment, the Soviet society was not a match for the United States in any area, in agriculture, in manufacturing, in education, in housing. They could not begin to compete with the United States, and the reason they could not was they had devoted far too high a percentage of their resources on a military budget.

Unfortunately, we have followed the Soviets in that path, and we have devoted a significant percentage of our resources to a military budget, albeit with a good reason, that we needed to defend against the Soviet threat.

Mr. Chairman, well, surely, in the face of the dramatic changes that have occurred in the Eastern bloc nations, when the Soviet threat is certainly not what it was 1, 10, 20 years ago, there is some significant saving we can find as a result of the fact that we do not have to meet that challenge on a daily basis.

Last year as we were beginning to talk about a peace dividend, some people came forward and said, "Well, despite the fact that the Soviet threat is not there, we need to be able to spend an increasing amount of money on defense to meet other regional challenges

around the world," and they pointed to the situation in the Persian Gulf and the war we had with Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against that war. I thought that the United States and the United Nations could give more time for economic sanctions to work. But be that as it may, I thought it was an impressive demonstration of the fact that the President of the United States did have the ability to get other nations in the world to join together in a coalition to carry out whatever strategy this new world order could create, and we were very successful militarily. We wiped out what was at that time the fourth largest armed force on the face of the Earth.

Mr. Chairman, we have faced the challenges. We have defeated the Soviet system in the cold war. We have defeated other regional challenges in the hot war.

This is not to suggest that we do not need a continuing military expenditure, but since the major challenges have been met, we do not need the same size military expenditure.

I would like to point out one more thing in regard to that entire process. Everyone began to focus on the new world order during that time, but after the war was over, people began to look home again. The question was not what about this new world reality, this new world order. The question became: What about the old American dream?

Mr. Chairman, the last 20 years when we have devoted our resources to the military have seen the dissipation of that American dream. In many cases that wonderful dream has become a nightmare, and that is the problem that this CBC budget attempts to address today. It wants to answer the question of whether a nurse's child will have health care and be able to go to a hospital, whether a carpenter's son will be able to buy a home in this country, whether an autoworker's child will ever be able to buy and afford an American car. Those are the kinds of questions that face this country now, not the outward look at the rest of the world.

We have our responsibilities, but we are meeting those responsibilities?

The place we are failing is here at home, and, Mr. Chairman, now is the time to focus on the old American dream, and the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is the blueprint for that dream.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEAT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1300

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

First, let me just compliment the gentleman for an outstanding statement. I concur in everything the gen-

tleman has said. I just want to underscore again for the purposes of emphasis two very significant points that the gentleman raised.

With respect to the Persian Gulf, the President did come before the American people and talked about the new world order, which contemplated greater international cooperation, realizing that there were other nations in the world that could come together, that the United Nations, the family of nations, could come together to begin to look at ways of resolving conflicts without the United States continuing to assume the notion of Pax Americana, but if you look at the President's proposal, it is still based on the notion that we have to continue to be the bully of the world, the police officer to the world, the 911 of the world, the mercenary of the world, when in fact we live in an international context, so the gentleman is right. If you put together the changing world situation, the significant diminution of the Soviet threat, the virtual total disappearance of the Warsaw Pact as a threat, the lessons of the Persian Gulf, the notions of greater internationalization and greater burden sharing, those are all rationalizations for a significant reduction in the military budget.

The second point, the gentleman raised the issue rhetorically in his remarks, that given those major threats vanishing off the radar screen, could we not cut some money? Well, as the gentleman well knows, the base line for our military budget is \$301 billion. Everybody is using that figure. The military budget rose to that level for at least a decade.

Now, with the Soviet threat and the Persian Gulf threat, we have been spending between \$150 and \$210 billion per annum on those two threats alone, and I repeat again that one does not have to be a brilliant Ph.D. to realize that \$210 billion worth of threat is either gone or significantly reduced, that only talking about a reduction of \$10 billion is an absurdity. It is an absolute sham.

So when we talk about a cut of \$50 billion in the first year, this is no radical idea. Clearly, with East Germany and West Germany now having united, where is the threat? But we have been spending \$150 billion a year there. When you add in the amount of money we spend, the \$70 billion to defend Korea and to defend Japan, those are major, major contributions of our military budget at a time when the American people understand precisely what it is that we understand, that the world has changed. It ought to produce a savings and we ought to take those savings and reinvest them in America, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me just to follow up on those remarks.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his further expla-

nation, because when people hear the huge numbers we are talking about, I think some people misunderstand the situation and believe that we are talking about cutting into the basic security of this Nation; but as the gentleman has rightfully pointed out, the security of this Nation is maintained not only in the continuing appropriations we would have for our military, but in the new reality of a lessened threat around the world.

Since the gentleman is standing, I would like to ask him to further elaborate on the conversion possibilities that are talked about in this budget, because I grew up in a military family and have military bases around my area, and a number of Members do. Members are concerned that there is going to be a worsening economic situation as a result of the fact that we are going to be withdrawing money from the military.

Now, I understand that there is a higher multiplier effect from money that is spent in the nondefense industry as opposed to the money that is spent in the defense industry, so in fact if we take that same money that we were spending in the defense industry, as I understand it, and put it to use in the domestic civilian industries, that we will actually get more bang for the buck—no pun intended—that we will get more jobs produced as a result, instead of less jobs produced; but I and many others are concerned about the direct impact on the military personnel who will be leaving the services as a result of the cutbacks in military spending, and I would be happy to have the gentleman address that point, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a very significant point and one that we have attempted to address with care, with compassion, and with substance.

First of all, when you look at the military budget, the military budget is a response to our national security needs. Our national security needs are based upon our perception of interests and threats to us.

Now, given the fact that two major threats have now been removed from the table, it means that our national security needs, first, are changed. It means that the threat level has changed, which means that our military budget also has to change.

If the cornerstone of that threat has been the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact and that is gone, that means that national security needs are going to be reduced and the military budget is going to go down. The military budget is not a jobs bill. It is a response to our legitimate national security needs, but when you bring the military budget down, there are people who are in the military who will be deactivated and become unemployed. There are people who build weapons systems and carry-

ing out contracts, those contracts are cancelled and they are not employed. We cannot afford to turn our backs on them. These are real human beings. They are American citizens. They have been either working in the military or working on weapons systems that relate to the military.

Now, as that budget goes down, there is going to be that level of pain and economic dislocation. We step up in this budget and say let us face that issue cleanly and in real terms in two ways. Let us deal with it in the context of the military. Let us also deal with it in the civilian sector.

On the military side, we say let us write a brand new GI bill for a number of these young people who will be coming home, provide them with the same opportunities that this gentleman received when this gentleman came back from the Marine Corps, too many years ago to talk about on the floor, and let us write a new GI bill to give them the opportunity to either go back to college or to gain greater training. Let us expand their training opportunities, but let us provide them with housing allowances so that when they come back they are not just dumped into American society. Let us give them unemployment benefits.

On the other side, since the military budget is going down we have to create in this society economic conversion opportunities that allow people to work, enhancing the quality of life in a more peace-oriented society.

So there we said let us take some of the peace dividend and begin to rebuild America's economic infrastructure. Not only does that allow us to be competitive in the world marketplace, it generates massive numbers of employment.

Second, when we attempt to put money into solving social problems other than rebuilding the economic infrastructure, that also generates employment.

Studies show that what we are attempting to do would generate on an annual basis minimally over 400,000 jobs which then provides an opportunity for people coming out of the military to go into civilian life with employment opportunities there, and we have got to start down that road.

Conversion is not an easy proposition, but as I said before, I have never met a person that demanded a job building a weapons system. People want to work. So we have got to provide them with an opportunity in a society where the military budget is going down, rather than to build B-2 bombers or MX missiles, build other resources that enhance the quality of human life.

So Mr. Chairman, we are very sensitive to the conversion issue and specifically in this budget we also place \$3 billion to directly address the issue of conversion.

So in conclusion, we are sensitive to it. We want to address it. There was not a great deal of caring when the military budget went up in the suffering that our constituents paid, but we are not cavalier in that regard. We recognize the pain as it is going down, and we attempt with fiscal policy and structural policy to address the issue of conversion in very specific ways. That is our response to the gentleman's question.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response and for his clear analytical approach to this matter. I think the gentleman has developed a very rational basis on which to base a military and a national budget and I certainly intend to be supportive of this budget.

I hope that we can today, during the debate, persuade other Members of the good common sense that this budget makes, as well as the fact that this budget attempts to set a new rationale for spending in this country that will be more focused on the people and the priorities of this Nation as they ought to be, instead of the outdated priorities of the cold war era, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

As we examine each of the various budget proposals, I ask each of you to consider the real state of this Nation. For those of you from districts not deeply affected by the recession, look beyond your district boundaries. In many areas of the country the average education level is eighth grade, and unemployment rates are well over 10 percent. In these same areas, hundreds of homeless visit soup kitchens and shelters each day and night, bridges and roads lay in ruins, and business after business enters bankruptcy. I ask you to look at communities like these, and make a decision to financially assist the areas of this country that suffer from the worst economic conditions.

Although your own communities may not suffer from these problems I have described, distressed areas affect everyone's lives. You see homeless on the streets around you, crime pervades in your cities, and long lines of unemployed and jobseekers cannot help but affect you psychologically. If we do not pay to fix these problems now, they can only get worse.

The alternative budget presents each of us the opportunity to help this country make the changes it needs now for a healthy future. Not only is this a measure that will aid our Nation's education system, build homes, roads, and other structures, and create new businesses, but this is a budget that will

promote long-term, lasting growth and prosperity, I urge every Member of this body to support the alternative budget, and vote for its passage.

In my own district in Detroit, the unemployment rate hovers around 30 percent. School dropout rates are as high as 40 percent. Homes lay abandoned as industries disappear at a rapid rate. About 250 homeless visit soup kitchens and warmth shelters each and every day. The infrastructure in many areas of Detroit has crumbled, as it has in many older cities, and is in great need of repair.

However, there is a ray of hope, and an opportunity for improving Detroit's chance of survival. A revival is on Detroit's horizon. Without Federal funds, however, the chances of a recovery are minimalized. The people of Detroit, like the people in many other cities in the United States, need money to attract new businesses, to fix their infrastructure, and to give their children a chance to succeed through education.

America needs to begin reinvesting in America. The alternative budget presents us with an occasion to fix our schools, to build our businesses, to revitalize our infrastructure, and to create a long-term solution to over a decade of economic hardships.

Not only does the alternative budget possess the contents to produce this result, but the plan pays for itself. A short-term investment will create tens of thousands of jobs, produce new revenue through taxation, and get this economy rolling once more.

The alternative budget creates a more comprehensive, long-term approach than any of the other proposals we have considered. This budget looks to futuristic technologies for the answer to massive unemployment and international competitiveness. This budget invests in our children's education, so that they will be able to understand, and evolve these futuristic markets. This budget creates jobs, but at the same time rebuilds our houses and infrastructure.

When the surface transportation bill became law, this country took a step in the right direction for helping itself. The \$151 billion included in this bill will not only put hundreds of thousands of people to work, but it will rebuild the roads and bridges in such desperate need of repair. The problem is that we have ignored other areas that are of equal or more importance to our recovery. We need to invest in education, business, health care, and future markets.

The momentum that this budget would create in a city like Detroit would be like that of a high-speed train. I can envision a future for Detroit where the manufacturing base consists of products like magnetically levitated trains, alternatively fueled vehicles, and high-definition television. Surrounding these industry facilities

would be a diverse group of small businesses. As these businesses developed, more people would want to move to the neighborhoods in the cities surrounding their workplaces, and with this, more parks and public meeting areas would develop. Detroit's renaissance center would serve as the cultural and commercial center of the city, and would be as safe as any gathering place in our Nation's cities.

I see all of these things, and more, for Detroit, but not without Federal funding for grants to businesses, for new educational programs, and for infrastructure projects. Again, the alternative budget provides the funding necessary to promote the recovery of cities like Detroit, and rural areas hardest hit by the recession.

In the 1930's and 1940's, World War II did to Europe what years of neglect have done to the United States today. A crumbled infrastructure was only an outward sign that Europe had been crushed economically and psychologically. The United States helped bring Europe back into the modern world by supplying the equivalent of \$70 billion in today's dollar for Europe's recovery following the war. Europe's current thriving market and relatively strong economic and social conditions are due in large part to this investment of American dollars. This foreign aid program, known as the Marshall plan, was one of the United States most successful foreign policies.

The United States needs its own economic recovery policy, a policy like the policies developed under the Marshall plan to rebuild this country. The alternative budget provides the opportunity to create long-term, cost-effective answers to our worst economic conditions, and is in many ways consistent with U.S. policy following World War II.

We have been given the occasion to downsize this Nation's defenses, and to give hard-working people in the defense sector the goal of building America's future in a more technologically advanced world. These industries need assistance for converting their efforts to more constructive, future-oriented endeavors. We can no longer afford to continue to build weapons for the sake of having something to build. There are new markets, markets that are more meaningful to helping our society. We need to tap into these future industries and use all of our human resources to produce commodities that are salable in a world market.

The defense cuts proposed in the alternative budget are deep, but necessary. Just as the former Soviet Union has been given shock therapy to convert to a capitalistic society, the United States needs its own shock therapy to break away from a society that functions around its defense sector. Although the cuts are deep, they are not damaging to the safety of this

country. We can afford to downsize our military even further than advocated in the other budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support these heightened defense cuts. I urge my colleagues to support solutions that advocate our Nation's long-term recovery.

□ 1310

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on our economic situation generally.

Mr. Chairman, our country has made a series of mistakes throughout the 1980's in economic policies, fiscal policies, tax policy; but the most egregious error it has made is to allow its national indebtedness to rise from \$1 to \$3.7 trillion, with no end in sight.

Mr. Chairman, a lady came up to me at a public meeting recently, handed me a sheet of paper, and it showed that just to service a debt of \$3.7 trillion is costing the U.S. Government and the U.S. taxpayer \$3,000 per second; per second, Mr. Chairman.

The average young American entering the work force today is being handed a bill by his or her Government for \$200,000 in excess taxes that that individual, that young person is going to have to pay throughout his or her working lifetime just to service the interest on the debt that has been run up in the last 12 years. That is \$200,000 for the average American worker to pay over 50 years, just to service the debt, \$200,000 that that person might have used to buy a home or to educate his or her children or to invest in a small business.

No, Mr. Chairman, that money is going, instead, to Washington to serve this huge burden of red ink that we have placed upon our children and our grandchildren, and we still do not have the courage to stanch the flow of it and get our fiscal house in order.

The 1980's, Mr. Chairman, was a decade of debt, personal debt that individuals ran up on their credit cards, consuming almost everything that they earned, saving very little, buying foreign goods, effecting a transfer to foreign investors allowing them to come in and buy up American resources, a decade where businesses ceased paying attention to the antitrust laws, which were not enforced, a decade of leveraged buyouts, golden parachutes, and resulting in huge amounts of debt on corporate books. And what did we get from all of that as a society? Not very much, Mr. Chairman. We got a great deal of corporate debt, a short-term mentality, with management looking over their shoulders watching those

who were creeping up who would purchase their businesses, a mentality not to make quality goods and services but rather to protect oneself from the corporate takeover. It's hard to see what it got for us.

□ 1320

Mr. Chairman, in Washington, Congress and the administration did the same thing. We passed a Gramm-Rudman law saying that we cared about deficits, but deficits rose, and rose, and rose throughout the decade as we used smoke and mirrors, rosy economic projections, all kinds of subterfuges to declare victory each year and go home as if there was no problem.

No progress was made throughout the 1980's, Mr. Chairman. It got worse, and worse, and worse.

Everyone in Washington, of course, is for reducing the deficit, but, Mr. Chairman, they are for reducing the deficit provided it is done on someone else's priorities. The political realities were gridlock, no progress, rising deficits, and now this huge burden of government, personal and business indebtedness has gotten to the point where it has dragged our economy into recession.

Rather our individual reaction to all of this debt caused people to stop spending so heavily about 1½ years ago. They found the financial ground under their feet unstable. They looked at their financial system, as S&L's were going under and banks were threatened. They looked at foreign competition in many cases eating American industries alive. They watched in fascination as communism fell but the resulting instability in the world situation added to their worry and made them more conscious of their relatively precarious financial situation.

Mr. Chairman, they did the right thing. They began paying off their own debt, getting their credit cards down, getting their own financial houses in order, and American businesses, recognizing the threat of competition, began to make themselves lean and mean and competitive, getting their inventories pared down, their debt brought under control, and unfortunately, their work forces in many cases were pared, and putting themselves in the most competitive mode they possibly can, recognizing their financial situation and that in the world.

So what should Government do? Mr. Chairman, Government had darn well get its fiscal house in order as well. And yet what are we doing? We are looking for a quick fix to this economic situation that took 12 years to build through trillions of dollars of new debt.

Is there any quick fix? No, Mr. Chairman, there is no quick fix. There is \$380 billion of debt this year alone, not even counting the S&L crisis. Do we have

any option of a quick fix? Of course not. We lost that option. We let it go.

What we have to do to solve these problems is to get back to the economic basics. There is no easy way out. It took ourselves 12 years to dig this hole, and now we are paying the price, and now we are going to have to get ourselves back with our economic head screwed on and do what we should have done a long time ago.

Mr. Chairman, the 1980's was a decade of consumption. Some call it a decade of greed. Whatever my colleagues prefer to call it, we did not save and invest, we did not invest in America, we did not protect our jobs. We consumed, and our jobs were lost. We lost our economic independence as a country in the 1980's because we allowed the Japanese, and the British, and the Germans, and others to buy up our resources as we bought their products, and they became the owners of too much of this country.

Is that healthy for America? No, it is not healthy for America. We have to go back to encouraging savings and investment and rebuilding our economic foundations. We have to go back and encourage exporting. Do my colleagues realize that the United States is the greatest exporting Nation in the world? No, it is not Japan, it is not Germany. Germany is second; Japan is third. The United States is the greatest exporter. But to stay that way, we are going to have to encourage export as well.

But most importantly, Mr. Chairman, most importantly, we must get our fiscal house in order, and it cannot be done quickly, but it can be done. It must be done. The burden of debt is dragging this economy down and destroying jobs and opportunities for Americans. People across the economic spectrum are paying the price. People at the margin in the economic spectrum are paying the highest price. It is most difficult for them. We have let all the American people down, but mostly those people.

I proposed in 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987 that we get control of our huge deficits by freezing spending by function, that is, defense, agriculture, transportation, et cetera forcing ourselves within those functions of government to choose the priorities that were most important and seeing this as a fair way of addressing this problem, requiring contribution by almost every sector of our American society. By 1987, I finally convinced the Committee on Rules that they should allow my budget to come to the floor. When it did, it was debated at length, and it got 64 votes, 64 people of courage who saw this as a problem and who saw it as an equitable way of solving it.

But as a whole the House of Representatives had no courage, no stomach. Things looked rose. Why worry about tomorrow? They said, "Let's let it go. We don't have to really deal with this problem."

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to stop saying that we can solve this problem on someone else's priorities. We are going to have to stop saying what we will not do to address the problem. We are going to have to start saying what we will and must do. We are going to have to pull ourselves together as a nation to make all this happen right. We are going to have to call on all of the American people to contribute to its solution, and, Mr. Chairman, it is not going to be easy.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to stop in this Chamber serving every special interest, and I do not use that word at all in a pejorative sense. I use it in a descriptive sense. There are many wonderful special interests in America that do deserve to be served, but we have got to stop serving the special interests and be responsible for the bottom line.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to Congress a dozen years ago, I sat down with one of the then senior Members, a gentleman from Illinois named John Erlenborn. I said to him, "You know, I think that we are voting so irresponsibly in this Chamber, John. Why is this?"

He said:

John, you know it's kind of strange. Fifteen years or so ago we used to take almost all of our votes in this Chamber by tellers. We just walked past and got counted. There were not many recorded votes and people voted a lot more responsibly because they didn't see their job as simply serving important and worthy special interests. They saw their job as being responsible for the country, for the bottom line, for the result.

Yes, since that time, special interests have had access to votes which are in almost every case recorded. They can easily publicize what we do. They can identify their friends and enemies, and they do. They can let their constituencies know who those friends and enemies are, and, Mr. Chairman, I am not at all proposing that we go back to fewer recorded votes. No, I am saying that we are going to have to create in this Chamber, and they are going to have to create in the other Chamber across the rotunda, an environment of responsibility for the country, not just for special interests, but for this process as a whole.

□ 1330

If we keep serving special interests, if we keep desiring to be 100 percent on everybody's list and be everybody's friend, I guarantee that we will continue to drop into this quagmire of stagnation with few jobs being created, with American industry not being competitive, and with the Government sucking up all the capital available running huge deficits and consuming far more than it takes in revenues.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a very, very serious problem for our country, and it must be addressed.

The exercise of the tax bill has begun. It passed the House. It is going

to pass the Senate and it is going to conference. The President is going to veto it, and the veto is going to be sustained. We will have all postured politically and stated our philosophies over and over again. And then what is going to happen? We will be back at that point to square one.

This budget does not require the signature of the President. It is not needed. The majority party is going to put into place the budget it wants. The only thing we can say about the process is that we have at least started at an early time. It is not really going to help address the long-term needs of our country.

We are going to have to decide that getting our fiscal house in order is the highest priority for our country, and that this is a crisis we are in. This is not going to go away. It is going to hang around for the long term unless we have the guts and the courage to address it and do what needs to be done to solve it and give something of ourselves and our interests to its solution.

We are going to have to forego the posturing. We are going to have to forego some of our own priorities. We are going to offer something of our priorities to solve this problem. We cannot live with it any longer. It is eating us alive. It is eating up our budget. The interest on the debt is now the third largest of all the functions of Government. It is the only one that rose during the 1980's in terms of a percentage of the budget as it crowded out spending in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, we must have the courage of our convictions. We must look to the interests of our Nation and not to serving special interests. We have to get this budget under control.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, let me first compliment the gentleman for his comments. I realize the gentleman is making a broader economic statement than focusing on the budget that has been offered by my distinguished colleagues who are the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. But first let me just say that I do respect the gentleman, and I do remember in 1987 when the gentleman offered his proposal.

There have been a number of occasions when this gentleman has agreed with the gentleman from Illinois. I admired the gentleman for his courage both in the proposal he has often offered and in the stands he has taken. It has required him sometimes to stand alone on the other side of the aisle. So I compliment the gentleman for his integrity and his courage.

I wanted to focus on the gentleman's comments about the deficit and just say to the gentleman that in the context of the budget that is being offered

on the floor today we do address the deficit. The gentleman stated in 1987 that he had a way of trying to address the deficit. What we are saying in this budget is that we are now debating fiscal year 1993. The difference from 1993 to 1987 is that the cold war is over. The cold war was going on in 1987. The Soviet Union has now dissipated. The Soviet Union was a reality in 1987. So what our budget does is attempt to define over an 8-year period a \$1 trillion peace dividend.

We are prepared to put some of that cash money, real money, not smoke and mirrors, to the deficit.

Second, what is another contributing factor to the deficit? A military budget that is going up and that is capital intensive as opposed to labor intensive. We start to bring the military budget down.

Another contributing factor is the recession itself. People who go back to work pay taxes and the deficit starts to come down. Our budget makes an effort to place billions of dollars in the infrastructure dealing with the social and economic dislocation of the country which starts to bring it down.

Another contributor to the deficit, as the gentleman points out, is the S&L crisis. As a matter of bookkeeping, we can take that off budget, but the gentleman and I both know that has an impact. That is the implication. I hope that is temporary, and I hope we get our hands on it.

But what is one of the most significant contributors to the conflict? The skyrocketing cost of health care. Even with the \$1 trillion that we locate in 8 years, if we do not get a handle on the skyrocketing cost of health care, the deficit is going to go through the ceiling. We are in the primitive stages of a debate on health care, but if we can come to grips with accessible, affordable health care that gets a handle on control of cost, that deficit is going to go down.

So to summarize, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. What I am trying to say to him is that I respect his remarks, and that the Congressional Black Caucus is focusing on the deficit in a very substantial, multidimensional fashion.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget for fiscal year 1993.

The disappearance of the Soviet military threat provides an opportunity to transform our economy from a cold war economy to one which responds to the real problems facing our Nation.

An effective, efficient transportation system is crucial to maintaining America's economic competitiveness. Many

Americans use public transportation to get to work, to health care and to the marketplace.

The CBC budget addresses this problem by establishing a program of financial assistance and economic incentives to create opportunities for public-private partnerships. These partnerships will make the domestic railcar industry more competitive, create jobs, and promote economic growth in the United States.

This budget also contains increased funds for economic conversion, providing for vocational training and education for skilled workers and technicians previously employed in industries with declining labor markets.

Mr. Chairman, through initiatives such as this we can boost America's economic growth and competitiveness, provide real jobs, and focus valuable resources on issues which affect all Americans.

The CBC alternative budget provides a sound blueprint for regaining our Nation's competitive edge and for improving the quality of life for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support it.

During the early 1970's, there were at least a half dozen U.S. firms that were in the business of building railcars. Today there is only a single domestic railcar manufacturer. Despite the interest in developing a high-speed rail service in the United States, there are no domestic manufacturers of rail cars to compete with the new generation of high-speed trains being produced by the French, Germans, and Japanese.

A primary cause for the decline of our domestic rail industry has been a lack of sufficient investment in research and development during the past decade. This lack of investment reflects an overall domestic problem. U.S. private and public investment in R&D lags far behind that of other major industrialized nations.

The CBC alternative budget recognizes the importance of a safe and effective transportation system. It increases Federal transportation funding by \$3.25 billion over the budget resolution and by \$3.29 over the Bush budget. It provides substantial increases for the operation of mass transportation systems, railroad capital improvements, highways and highway safety.

The CBC alternative budget also provides \$25 million to fund legislation I introduced last month to improve the competitiveness of America's rail car industry.

Every year our Federal Government spends millions to help local areas acquire railcars for public transit systems. Almost all of those funds support foreign railcar suppliers rather than our very own domestic manufacturers.

□ 1340

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss procedural reform, budget reform that I think would benefit all of the budget proposals that we have before us yesterday and today, and that is to talk about the concept of capital budgeting.

The Federal deficit we all agree is viewed as the Nation's No. 1 fiscal problem. Yet our present system of a cash-based, unified budget makes absolutely no distinction between operating expenses and capital investments. This can lead to some very, very costly mistakes.

Operating expenses and capital assets differ, markedly differ, in that capital assets such as buildings, roadways, airports, have a long life and provide future benefits to the society. Operating expenses provide no future benefits. They are part of the cost of operating the Federal Government.

Single-number focus on the Federal deficit based on the premise that all outlays and debt are the same, whether for capital investments or operating expenses. The aggregating of capital assets and operating expenses into the same pot leads to very uneconomical decisions.

For example, under the present rules, a \$10 million outlay for a highway, such as we have authorized in the bill earlier this year, contributes to the deficit the same as a \$10 million outlay for jet fuel. Yet clearly the road has future value. The jet fuel is consumed all within the same year.

Likewise credit programs, such as direct loans and loan guarantees, are also a form of capital assets, in that they provide a form of future return. Yet under our present budget rules, an outlay of \$10 million as a direct loan contributes to the deficit the same as \$10 million in grants, even though the \$10 million in direct loans does not in fact represent \$10 million in costs to the Government.

But what are the practical advantages of moving toward a capital budget? First, it would definitely produce a clearer picture of the composition of Federal expenditures and correct what I think is a budget bias against physical capital investments.

Second, the capital budget would more accurately report the costs of the Federal Government's credit programs. The estimated subsidy costs of direct loan guarantees would be reported in the operating budget. And third, a capital budget would help focus public attention on the Nation's physical infrastructure needs. It would also lead to the practice of depreciating assets and would encourage replacement planning.

Capital budgeting has a lot of supporters, but it has some detractors. Perhaps the biggest fear expressed by

detractors is that a capital budget would somehow detract from human services programs. That is, that a capital budget places too much emphasis on brick and mortar projects, and thus shifts focus away from social service programs that do in fact reap future returns by encouraging development of healthy minds and bodies. I am talking about whether it is school lunch, prenatal care, education, all of those programs clearly also have a capital component.

These programs are just as fundamental to our Nation's future, and I would propose we also explore the proposition of developing a concept of human capital spending, just as we do for physical assets.

I would also suggest that we can develop a capital budget as a component of our current unified budget. I think it would be counterproductive and give the appearance of cooking the books if we were to use two sets of numbers in our budget process. Rather, by working within our present unified budget, we will nevertheless be able to distinguish between spending for assets versus spending to cover operating expenses. I think we will be better able to target scarce financial resources in this way.

My intent, frankly, in seeking time to speak on this suggestion is to suggest that we really need to be much better informed than we presently are about tough spending decisions confronting Congress.

We have been talking for years about the urgency to repair deteriorating inventory of bridges, roads, water, and wastewater treatment systems. But instead of tackling this problem on a crisis-by-crisis basis, capital budgeting would allow us to adopt a much more orderly process, a much more rational process, for addressing these needs.

During the late 1980's the General Accounting Office completed several major reports on the capital budgeting process. They enthusiastically endorsed the concept that I am talking about here this afternoon. The Budget Committee in its report on the budget resolution for last year, fiscal year 1991, included a section in its appendix discussing the pros and cons of capital budgeting, and I want to thank the committee for its interest then, and encourage them to continue to work with GAO and OMB.

In one of their reports, GAO cited the fact that 37 States employ capital budgeting. Just about every business in this country, large or small, uses capital budgeting as a tool to measure the depreciation of their assets and to plan for orderly replacement of those assets.

We, the Federal Government, which is the largest consumer of goods and services in our national economy, presently are unable, literally unable, to measure our consumption of capital assets.

I want to urge again that this is a concept, an idea, whose time I think

has more than come. It is an idea that I think would give us a much better tool in measuring what it is really costing us to operate the Federal Government, versus what represents investments in the future of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage support for this worthwhile idea.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, in my 15 years in Congress, I have always supported the Black Caucus budget because it was the best budget. Sometimes we give titles and we talk in generic terms. I want to zero in on just one area, and there are so many areas why this budget is the best budget, honestly. But I want to zero in on one area.

I am very, very pleased to see that in this alternative budget they cut the figure of research for the Defense Department, and they give that money to the area of health.

Mr. Chairman, let me be very specific. Right now American taxpayers pay \$36 billion on how to find more creative ways for cruise missiles and cluster bombs, et cetera. By the way, the technology used in the Persian Gulf crisis was 1960's and 1970's technology. So we are way ahead of the eight ball when it comes to these areas. So we spend \$36 billion.

The American people ought to know that what we spend to find cures for diseases is only \$8½ billion. Ninety percent of all research funded programs in this country related to health are Government sponsored.

I think most Americans would like to find a cure for cancer so that every child was immunized against cancer. I think most Americans would like to know more about heart disease and would like to have women included in clinical trials so that we understand the difference in terms of hormonal influences on our health care.

I think most Americans want to know why we only spend \$8½ billion for health research, but \$36 billion for R&D research for more creative ways to find violent weaponry and so on.

What the Black Caucus budget does is take \$11 billion out. They still have \$25 billion left for R&D for the Pentagon to find creative ways for those weapons, and they transfer that to the area of health. So what we have now is \$25 billion for Pentagon research, and about \$20 billion still left for health research.

Mr. Chairman, what do we want to find cures for? Why is it that 1 out of 11 men get prostate cancer, including some of our leaders?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for everything she has done and everything she has said, and tell everybody here, I want to make her blush, it is her birthday. We are really glad you are here. You are a great national treasure. Thank you for reminding us how important the health care issues are in this budget.

□ 1350

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. Maybe with the proper research I would live a little longer.

Mr. Chairman, why is it we have 1 out of 11 men with prostate cancer and we have really very few dollars in the budget at NIH, the National Institutes of Health, to find a cure for prostate cancer?

One out of nine women have breast cancer. These are epidemic diseases, my friend. Yet we spend about \$100 million in finding more knowledge about breast cancer. Ovarian cancer. We do not even have an early detection method for ovarian cancer. The list goes on.

Alcoholism. We do not even have research for women who happen to be alcoholics, and we should find a way to lick that disease, besides, and find out the reasons why people are more prone to diseases like drugs and alcohol.

All I am trying to say is that this is so sensible, this is so sensible, this budget. It is so sensible to say, "Let us reinvest in people. Let us reinvest in people, not necessarily in weapons." Yet they still allow more money for reinvestment in weapons, and not as much money for the research areas of health.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one final thing. If we cannot do as a Nation what we ought to do in finding cures for diseases, as the Black Caucus budget would allow us to have that flexibility, shame on us. Americans expended \$90 billion for Alzheimer's disease, and yet we will only spend about \$100 to \$200 million to find a cure. Four out of five grants recommended by the National Institutes of Health to get funded so we can lick some of these diseases, and by the way, bring down the cost of health care, are rejected by NIH, not because they want to but because they do not have the dollars. So transferring this money from creative ways, more creative weapons, to finding cures for diseases is the right approach.

That is why we ought not to talk about the Black Caucus budget in generic terms. We ought to say line for line, and the American people want to know exactly what is in the budget. It is a great budget. I compliment the gentleman from California, and all the Black Caucus members, actually, for this terrific budget, so we really have an option.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Ohio yield to me?

Ms. OAKAR. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentlewoman from Ohio has zeroed in on this particular area. We did reduce military research and investment by in excess of \$11 billion. We then place in excess of \$12 billion over and above current services in the health area. Let me just break down very quickly where we put that additional \$12 billion.

We put \$10 billion for health care services to those who are without health care coverage or the means to secure health services, \$10 billion. We put \$250 million for drug abuse education and research. We put \$1.1 billion over and above current services for HIV-AIDS research, which challenges this entire country.

Ms. OAKAR. If the gentleman would yield, it is an epidemic.

Mr. DELLUMS. We put \$500 million over and above current services for AIDS treatment. We put \$500 million over and above current services for prevention, dietary health education.

So we did attempt to make some significant shifts to enhance the quality of life. Thank you for focusing on that.

Ms. OAKAR. I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the substitute. As we all know, this substitute is an annual event, providing an opportunity for this Chamber's so-called progressives to take the floor and tell us the virtues of big government.

I find the term "progressive" interesting. You would think it meant a new, vibrant, and exciting ideal for our Nation. However, we all know what it has come to mean.

It means more of the same failed policies. The welfare state, the punishment of success, dependency on government, and the politics of class envy.

Over the last 30 years, we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on these programs, and we have seen the results—decaying inner cities, reliance on the State, and the breakdown of family values.

Now, to correct these problems, they want more of the same. In other words, more bureaucracy and more money from the taxpayer.

Of course, we hear the familiar strains of alleged cuts over the last 12 years. These programs have not been cut. Some of the growth has been constrained, but they are larger than ever—and they continue to fail.

One of the most hollow refrains of this debate is that it is for our children. I only wish they shared the same concern for these same children who

are being saddled with the largest debt in world history.

We are currently \$4 trillion in debt. We are more than broke. We are so far in debt that, with interest, we can run \$100 billion surpluses for the next half century and still owe money.

If this debate is about people, as the Budget Committee chairman said, we are obligated to avoid leaving these same people with this mountain of debt. It shouldn't matter whether you will still be in office.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing progressive about this budget. Tenant ownership, choice in schools, enterprise zones and self-dependency. These are progressive ideas. Not larger government.

Let's reject this outdated and bloated budget, along with the Democrat's budget. We owe at least that much to our children and grandchildren. That is one debt we can pay.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pull a line from the gentleman from California in one of his National Democrat Conventions. "That the responsibility is here to work for black people, white people, yellow people, red people. That is what we have a responsibility to do."

We should be here working as Republicans and Democrats and Hispanic caucus and Black Caucus in the interests of the people. That is what we were sent here to do. We have got to get together and start doing this. If we do not do this, we are going to continue to have separate budgets and nothing passed in the interests of the people of this country or the children of this country.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield to me?

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, just to set the record straight, there are four budget alternatives that were presented here, two on the side of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS], and two on this side of the aisle.

I might recall that the title of this budget, though it was written by predominantly Black Caucus members in association with other Members of Congress who do refer to themselves as progressive Members, we do, and we do take pride in that, the title of this budget is "A Budget for New World Realities and for Rebuilding America."

So what we are attempting to do here is to write a budget for the entire United States. The fact that the gentleman writes a Republican budget I would assume is a budget for Republicans and Democrats. Blacks can write a budget that speaks to all people in this country. That is exactly what we have attempted to do. Where we have differences, let us have legitimate differences. This is not some narrowly constrained budget. The fact that it

was written by us does not mean it is a black budget. It is a national budget.

We have documented here, for 3½ months of concerted effort, significant detail. We were prepared to put this budget out here in the full light of day for 8 hours.

I might just add that President Bush did not want to put his budget out here for 8 hours. We are prepared to stand public scrutiny, discuss the budget. Where the gentleman has legitimate differences, let us have those legitimate differences.

The point I am simply trying to make to the gentleman is this is indeed a national budget, so I hope there was no implication that I could misconstrue that meant that the gentleman was putting a racial connotation on this budget simply by virtue of the fact that Black Caucus members sat down and wrote this budget.

I would ask the gentleman if he would respond to that.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would be only too happy to respond. If anybody is going to bring race into the discussion, then I would suggest the gentleman from California is doing that. I certainly have not intended to bring that in.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to understand the gentleman's comment. That is all.

Mr. LEWIS of California. My comment was, in bringing your statement from a national convention in, that we have to look at all alternatives. And I think that the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Absolutely.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I will also borrow another statement from a friend of the gentleman from California:

We as Democrats, Republicans, Black Caucus, Hispanics, Independents, should be looking for common ground on this budget in the interests of the people of this country.

□ 1400

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield briefly, one of the reasons why we brought this budget here for 8 hours is to attempt to engage our colleagues, to see if we could find common ground. I am sure the gentleman would agree with me, to debate a budget for 30 minutes, or 1 hour, or 2 hours certainly does not give time to explore common ground. We thought that maybe with an 8-hour discussion maybe we could find some common ground. So it is in that human spirit that we offer this budget.

I am an advocate of the coalition, so the gentleman is absolutely correct. That is why we think this budget can stand the full light of scrutiny, and Members across the various lines that divide us should join us in supporting it.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would adopt this budget that was put together by the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Caucus. It is the only budget that allows us to address two things: First of all, the future of this country, and secondly, the despair in this country.

It is the only budget that set us on a road to recovery, recovery from the misery that millions and millions of Americans feel in this country on a daily basis as they realize that they cannot obtain a first-class education for their children, no matter what neighborhood they live in; as they realize that many of their children are going to school hungry, no matter what neighborhood they live in; as college graduates search the want ads for job opportunities and realize that jobs are being foreclosed. One in seven in California is on unemployment, and 30 percent of the welfare in California is now as a result of the recession. Millions of families are falling to the ground to be crashed upon by despair.

This is the only budget that offers relief. This is the only budget that offers a plan for the future, not for today's political problem, not to try to get by the constraints we have put on ourselves, to finesse the walls, to finesse the budget, but it is about solving the problems.

We tried it Mr. Bush's way. We tried it Mr. Reagan's way. We have now been left with a country with dramatically higher unemployment than when they started, with more homeless people, with an education system in shambles, with more children dying in the first year of life than before, with the absence of opportunity for economic growth, and a society saddled by debt, as has been referred to so very often, because rather than pay as he goes, the Republicans chose to borrow. We tripled our household debt, business debt, and governmental debt in a decade, and the carrying charges are wearing down our economy. And in that process the absence of opportunity is wearing down our families.

There is a belief on the Republican side of the aisle that somehow you can generate savings and smaller deficits by withdrawing services. If we cut low-income housing, then low-income people will go away. If we cut nutritional programs, hungry people will go away. If we cut psychiatric services, crazy people will go away.

It does not happen that way. Time and again it has been documented in this country by Government, by the private sector, by the nonprofit sector, across the board, the answer and the savings are in the extension of services.

It is in the extension of services, of a nutrition program that reduces the cost of hungry children in an education

setting. It is the extension of the Head Start Program that reduces the cost of a child not prepared to go to school. It is the extension of psychiatric services that holds a family together that is stressed. It is the extension of drug treatment for an addicted person that reduces the long-term care costs for that person. It is the extension of maternal and child health care that reduces the cost of the death and the destruction of newborn babies in this country and their families.

We cannot cut our way to the kinds of savings that the Republican budget, the President's budget, reflects because that only results in misery, not in the answer to the long-term problems of this country. I would hope that Members would support this budget.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to take just a couple of minutes to talk about the budget. My friend from California just talked, and I am sure we all share a similar goal, but it is interesting how differently we view the way to get there. The gentleman from California obviously sees the road to success with big government providing all of the programs. I see it a little differently, and I rise to talk a little bit about budgets, because I presume budgets are designed to give some direction as to where we are going. They are designed to plan for movement, they plan for expenditures. They are a short-term plan, to be sure, because this is an annual budget, and the Congress changes from time to time. But if a budget is to be in a direction, frankly I have not come across the budget in this past 2 days that I think goes in the direction that I would like to go.

Let me tell Members what I support. I think we should have less government rather than more. I think we should work to develop an environment in which the private sector can prosper rather than to handicap it. I think we should have less taxes rather than more, and leave the money in the hands of the citizens of this country.

I think we ought to be working to reduce the deficit, not to increase the deficit. It seems to me if we are going to have more jobs, which is really the answer to where we are, they are in the private sector. Wealth is created in the private sector. Wealth is not created in the Government. There can be no jobs in the Government sector until we take the money from the wealth that is created in the private sector to pay for them.

But these budgets do not do that. These budgets call indeed for more government, for more spending, and I understand that. It is simply a different view. I do not think that is the view that has brought us where we are. I do not think those are the kinds of basic

principles that have made this the strongest country in the world. Listening to my friend from California, one would not think that is the case. It is the case. This is the strongest country. Of course we are not where we want to be, but we are the best country in the world, and I would hope all Members agree with that.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, we all agree that this is the best country in the world. I would like for the gentleman to explain how he feels that our budget increases the Government. We are reducing drastically the defense budget. The Government runs the defense apparatus. It is the Government that runs it, and the expenditures that we would make with the money saved from the defense budget going to many sectors of our economy, most of it to the private sector.

We are going to provide more services for human beings, but the private sector will run it.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I am not talking about doing services. I am talking about reducing the size of government so that we can do more in the private sector. I would like to see one where the fire walls are not taken down in your Democratic proposal so that we reduce more.

So I guess the point I am trying to make, and I do not expect everyone to understand, is that I think there are some principles which have made this country great. I think it is less government rather than more. I think it is encouragement for the private sector rather than more restrictions, more taxes. I think the gentleman would agree that is where jobs come from. I think we ought to have less taxes rather than more and leave the money in the hands of the people so that they can spend it. I think we ought to be reducing the deficit.

I have watched the deficit, as you have, for a very long time. I have not been here long, but we have not done well with the deficit. You have not done well. I have not done well. For years, as citizens, we watched it, paid no attention to it. Now it has gotten to where it has taken all of the capital out for our growing potential, and now we are paying 25 percent of our debt as debt service expenses.

We want more jobs instead of looking for safety nets. We want to be producing jobs, and that all results in more personal freedom and people being able to decide for themselves how they spend their money, where they work, when they work, and how they invest. These are the kinds of things we ought to be doing rather than saying we know how to do it better, and we will take the money and we will do it through the Government.

So I am simply saying that if this is a direction, this is not the direction that I would choose.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

First, let me say I appreciate the gentleman's sincerity, and as I have said before, we can intellectually and politically differ on these matters.

First, let me just say when the gentleman said we have not done as well on the deficit, those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus have offered alternative budgets, and this is perhaps one of the best kept secrets in America, that would have reduced the deficit significantly for over a decade now.

□ 1410

So we are out here saying you have not done it in the past, take us on this time.

But with respect to the gentleman's issue of less government, let us think that through for a moment, because the American people generally when you say let us have less government, they say fine, but then when you start talking specifically, are you saying we should not do as much as a government to protect our environment, should we do less as a government to protect our consumers, should we do less as a government to create a safe and healthy workplace, should we do less in education, and that is a governmental function, should we do less in rebuilding the infrastructure, less in health education? Suddenly we are not talking about less government.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman can go through this whole litany. But let me tell him something: Most of the things that he is talking about he is not happy with.

We have increased the expenditure for education, we have increased the expenditure for all of these items over the years, we have, and the gentleman knows of that. The point is that maybe we need to take a look at doing some things differently. The idea that the gentleman is unhappy, for example, and let me use education for the gentleman's friend from California, education, he says, is a failure.

So what do we want to do? Continue to put more money doing the same thing that we have been doing before.

I am suggesting that we need to make some changes. We need to deliver these services in a different way. If they are a failure and if you do not like them, and you obviously do not, why do we not try to do something different?

I appreciate my friend, and I appreciate the exchange. I have a little different point of view; this budget does

not go the direction that I would like to go.

Mr. DELLUMS. I respect our differences.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, to make the following statement, that we would like to move into a section in this debate which focuses primarily on education.

We have two speakers who will take about 20 minutes to make general statements, and after that, I would like to respectfully request that the opposition invite to the floor some Members who would like to particularly engage us on the subject of education which we will be discussing after 20 minutes have passed and these other two speakers have made their statements, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES], who are all members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and we will be discussing education, and we would certainly like to have persons who want to talk about education engage us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud today to be here as a member of the Progressive Caucus working in alliance with the Congressional Black Caucus, because for many years millions of people throughout this country, when they tried to find some sense in what was going on in terms of budgetary policy, they looked at the Congressional Black Caucus for sense, and we formed the Progressive Caucus, many of us, because we believe that the Government is no longer representing ordinary people, that there are radical changes in terms of the political situation in this world, and that we think it is time to understand that just as the world is changing fundamentally, we have got to fundamentally change the priorities of this country.

If there has ever been a time in the modern history of this country to give hope to tens and tens of millions of Americans who have lost hope, now is the time, and this is the budget that does it.

It makes no sense to me to be spending \$130 billion a year defending Western Europe against a nonexistent enemy when, at the same time, we have 5 million children in our own country who are hungry, we have 2 million people in our country who are sleeping out on the streets, we have an educational system which is failing, and an infrastructure which needs massive repair, a health-care system which is not working.

Now, if the American people want to understand what today is about, let me tell you that the debate we are having today is the most important debate that this Congress is going to be having.

Are you concerned about the issue of health care? Are you concerned that 85 million Americans have no health insurance or only partial insurance?

Most of us are in agreement that the only real solution to the health care crisis is going to be a single-payer national health care system guaranteeing health care to all people, but until we get there, what this budget does is put \$10 billion—real dollars—into health care so that we can begin to provide health care for those who do not have it.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard for years about the crisis in education. We have an educational President. But are you concerned that 25 percent of our kids are dropping out of high school? Are you concerned that millions of low-income and working-class kids cannot afford to go to college?

This budget puts \$2.6 billion more into education. That is real dollars.

We have heard a lot of talk about how wonderful the Head Start Program is. This budget puts real money into Head Start, puts \$2 billion more into Head Start and moves us in the direction of finally creating a situation where every kid in America can take advantage of the Head Start Program.

People are concerned about juvenile delinquency. They are concerned about our kids turning to drugs. They are concerned about the hopelessness that our young people feel from Vermont to Harlem.

This budget puts \$2 billion into job-training programs so that we can say to our young people, "Do not give up hope, do not turn to drugs. This is an opportunity for you to get real employment and earn a real wage."

One of the ironies of what goes on in this body—and this is an issue I feel very strongly about—is when some people want to go to war, they take out the bands, they take out the big flags, and they say to the young men and women of this country, "We have got a war for you. Go on over there." But 40 or 50 years after that war when our veterans are 60, or 70, or 80 and they need help in the veterans' hospitals, we have forgotten about these people, no more big bands, no more big parades. This budget recognizes the sacrifice made by our veterans. We have got \$2 billion to go to veterans' medical care and to other programs for our veterans.

This program recognizes the decline in family farming throughout Vermont and throughout this country and does away with the special assessments that the 1990 budget agreement placed on family farmers.

This budget provides for a GI bill of rights.

This budget puts real money into housing, into unemployment compensation, into transportation.

My friends and fellow Americans, the cold war, thank God, is over, but there are some people who, despite the fact that the Soviet Union no longer exists, despite the fact that the Warsaw Pact no longer exists, they still want to put all kinds of money into absurd weapons systems and into defending nations that no longer need defending and that are wealthier than we are.

The only difference that I have with this budget is that the title is wrong. The title for this budget should be that this is a budget of hope, this is a budget that says to working people, elderly people, poor people, and the vast majority of people in our country—millions of whom have given up on the political system, millions of whom no longer vote, no longer believe that this institution can represent their interests—what this budget says is that this Government is prepared to stand with you, the elderly, the homeless, the children, the working people who are seeing a decline in their standard of living.

And I say to my friends who still want the budget money to go into weapons, want an inflated military budget, now is the time to rethink, to rethink the direction of this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is no issue, no issue that we are going to be debating that is more important than this issue.

This Nation is a great country, but clearly we have lost our way in the last 10 to 20 years.

We can regain our way. We must change our fundamental priorities. We must give hope to those people who have lost hope.

I beg of my fellow Members of Congress, speak to the American people who are losing faith in this institution, in the Government. Stand with the working people, elderly people, and poor people. We can do it. Now is the time for fundamental change in priorities, and this budget does it.

I am proud that the Progressive Caucus is working with the Black Caucus. Let us go forward, and let us give hope to the American people.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

□ 1420

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman. It is with great pride that I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus, Progressive Caucus alternative budget proposal. I would like to sincerely congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his thoughtfulness, his courage, and his commitment in bringing this budget forward. It is rare that I cast a vote with as much enthusiasm as I will on behalf of this budget resolution.

I would also like to thank Congressman TOWNS for his leadership of the

Black Caucus, and for his work in developing this budget. We all owe both of you a tremendous debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, a budget reflects our national priorities. No other single document outlines the real values of our Nation as our budget does.

The budget is the bottom line. The budget is not rhetoric, it's dollars and cents. You cannot hide behind numbers the way you can words.

So each year, we in Congress are asked to put our money where our mouth is. This is the time for all the members who talk about education, who talk about jobs, who talk about health care, who talk about veterans, who talk about the peace dividend—to put up, or shut up.

We have before us the one budget alternative that reflects the new world order. The Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is the only budget which provides a fundamental shift in priorities to match the fundamental changes in the world.

I would like to take a few moments to compare our budget with the President's proposal. The contrast is striking and reflects dramatically different views of how our country should look.

Our budget cuts \$150 billion from the military budget in the next 4 years. The President's cuts a mere \$50 billion over 5 years.

The President says there will be no peace dividend. That is only true in the absence of political leadership.

The peace dividend resulting from the CBC budget would be \$1 trillion in military savings by the turn of the century. For anyone who cares about solving social problems, for anyone who cares about reducing the deficit, for anyone who cares about fundamentally strengthening our economy—this is your budget.

Our budget proposes an additional \$12 billion for health care compared to the President's budget. The CBC alternative sets aside funds to fund any health care plan that Congress agrees upon because we believe health care reform is a fundamental priority for this country.

Our budget increases community and regional development funding by almost \$4 billion over the President's proposal. Moreover, our budget adds \$3.3 billion to the President's request for transportation programs. Everyone talks about how our infrastructure and our cities are crumbling—our budget does something about it.

Our rural communities are struggling. The rural poor have been devastated by Reagan-Bush policies. Our budget adds \$2.5 billion to the agriculture account over the President's request. We must give family farmers a chance to survive—and the CBC budget does.

In education, our budget adds \$4 billion in education funds for student loans and block grants to the States.

We fully fund Head Start, another \$2 billion increase. Our budget is the education budget, not President Bush's.

In housing, we add \$5 billion for low- and moderate-income housing construction and rehabilitation programs. Instead of transferring funds from real housing programs into Jack Kemp's HOPE initiative—as the President's budget requests, our budget truly empowers people by creating desirable homes for low-income people. Up to 3 million Americans are homeless. Tenant ownership does nothing to help these people. Housing funds were reduced by 75 percent in the 1980s, yet the President only takes housing proposals from proven housing programs, to promote a phony one, HOPE, which does nothing to address the real problems of poor people.

With respect to veterans, there are real differences between our approach and the President's.

Let me briefly highlight some of Bush's cutback proposals:

There are \$800 million in unidentified cost savings in housing programs, thereby reducing funding for housing programs overall by 67 percent.

Increasing the fees, from three-fourths of 1 percent to 1¼ percent, for veterans to secure a VA home loan.

Expands the groups required to make medical copayments, including, for the first time, some service-connected veterans.

Eliminates \$50 million in travel benefits for veterans living within 50 miles of a VA health care facility.

Cuts \$45 million from State veterans nursing home construction.

And, \$43 million cut from vocational rehabilitation programs.

The President has proposed robbing Peter to pay Paul in his budget request. His modest increase in the medical budget is offset by the reductions I have mentioned.

Our budget rescinds these cutbacks, but it does much more. I would like to read a letter we received this morning from the Disabled American Veterans, a highly-respected and active veterans advocacy organization. Let me read that letter to you now:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC March 5, 1992.

Mr. Edolphus Towns,
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TOWNS: On behalf of the more than 1.3 million members of the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) and its Ladies' Auxiliary, I take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Congressional Black Caucus for your recognition of the critical funding needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

As you so aptly stated in your Fiscal Year 1993 Alternative Budget, "During the decade of the '80s, veterans' benefits were reduced significantly, in a real sense breaching the commitment the nation made to veterans as a recompense to their willingness to risk life and limb for country. These cuts have im-

pacted many veterans in dire ways, particularly as regards to their health care needs."

We in the DAV know first hand how difficult it is to obtain quality VA health care and benefits delivery in a timely fashion. Our members continue to be subjected to nine-month waits for clinic appointments; delays in receiving medications and medical supplies; closed access to medical care because of staffing and equipment shortages; busy signals when calling the VA for benefits information and assistance; long delays in the adjudication of benefit claims; and the inability to receive vocational rehabilitation at the time it is most needed.

The \$3.25 billion increase over the President's request for VA benefits and services in Fiscal Year 1993, called for by the Congressional Black Caucus, will go a long way toward improving the quality of VA health care and benefits' delivery deserved by our nation's service-connected disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors. Truly, the Alternative Budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus for Fiscal Year 1993 demonstrates, in a most meaningful way, its commitment to our nation's veterans population for their sacrifices in defense of this great nation.

Again, Chairman Towns, I thank you and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for your efforts in recognizing the critical funding shortages in the Administration's Fiscal Year 1993 VA budget request.

Sincerely,

CLEVELAND JORDAN,
National Commander.

As has been talked about, the cornerstone of this budget proposal is a \$50 billion reduction in military spending this year. No other budget being offered today makes such a significant downpayment on the peace dividend.

Some are complaining that we cut too much, too soon. I cannot understand this logic. In 1979, at the height of the cold war, our military budget was \$179 billion. Today, at the end of the cold war, we are told that the \$240 billion in defense spending proposed in this bill is unsafe.

I have heard people say that we cannot be caught unarmed the way we were after World War II—and therefore, we must continue to spend \$300 billion a year in defense. This is an argument without foundation. The world is dramatically different from 45 years ago. We have the technological capability to monitor the production of any potential nuclear weapons facility. To suggest that this country would sit back and watch another country build a nuclear arsenal that could threaten our national security is ludicrous.

Others have suggested that we cannot cut the military budget too fast because it would cost jobs. More than any other budget, by far, the CBC budget alternative addresses the transition from a military to a peacetime economy.

It is inevitable that this country must make such an economic transition. To suggest that we wait, or that we continue to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on programs that we do not need is silly.

This budget looks forward. This budget reinvests significant amounts of

defense savings back into the people and communities that have depended on military spending for their economic well-being. No other budget proposal contains the structural, transitional investment that is absolutely critical for the new world. Instead of saying we can't cut the military because of job loss, we propose to deal with this economic dislocation now, not later.

We achieve this objective in the following ways:

Up to \$8 billion of the \$9 billion in savings in troop reductions will go directly into a package of severance pay, pension benefits, and job training for the thousands of men and women who have chosen the military as their career.

The \$3 billion in savings will be invested in plant restructuring, retooling, job training and income support for communities with military-dependent economies. This money will be used to help laborers who have devoted their lives to the production of military hardware. Literally thousands of communities have come to depend on the existence of a particular weapons system.

The other budgets before us recognize the need for economic conversion—it is obvious. But this budget makes a real investment in the new economy.

In the new world order, we simply do not need big ticket, strategic war items. Even President Bush has conceded that. We owe these workers and communities transition assistance as we move to the future.

Last, as I mentioned earlier, \$3.25 billion will go toward veterans services, with \$2 billion for improvements in the veterans care system and \$1.25 billion for veterans' housing, job training, and education.

This budget's peace dividend is directed to military workers and families. Who, more than they, deserves to share in our cold war victory?

This country's economy must change. A reliance on a military-industrial complex that no longer reflects our national interest is wasteful, narrow minded and ultimately unfair to this Nation's work force.

What we have done in the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is visionary. We confront the economic realities that will come as our military winds down. This budget does not simply cut military spending and forget about the consequences. It offers a real, honest response to the changes that will occur in military structure. It would be irresponsible to offer a program of military spending reductions without safeguards for military employees, economic conversion and veterans benefits. But this proposal has both.

I came to Congress in the hopes that we were entering a new era. The peace dividend is the only hope in areas like

south central Los Angeles, which I represent.

That is why this budget is so important. It is the only budget with hope for those who are being left out. In Los Angeles, we have a highly successful program called Teen Post, which is a gang and drug prevention program.

In the late 1960's Teen Post was highly visible and accessible in our community. It operated 150 centers for these at risk youth. The program offered a variety of services and recreational activities for our kids to keep them busy, to keep them occupied, to keep them from falling prey to a destructive lifestyle.

Today, due to funding shortages, Teen Post only operates five centers in all of Los Angeles. It is a tragedy. Anyone who reads the newspaper knows that gangs and drugs continue to plague our streets.

Now is the time to invest in programs like Teen Post. This budget does that. We have put \$300 million into a program so that all cities who have gang-related problems can duplicate the successful efforts of our Los Angeles program.

That is why the peace dividend is so important. Without it, we cannot offer our people hope. Only with a dramatic shift in priorities can we finally tackle the social problems which plague so many areas of this country.

I am proud of this budget. I am proud of the work of RON DELLUMS and ED TOWNS. This is the first chance I will have to support a CBC budget alternative, and it could be the most significant vote I cast.

I plead with my colleagues to change the direction of this Nation. We are at an apex in history. If we do not do it now, it will be too late for millions of Americans. I urge support for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative budget proposal.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the additional time.

Let me close by saying, I have not been able to get into all of the areas that I would like to discuss, but I did have an opportunity to highlight what is happening with veterans, because as a new Member of Congress serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been shocked and surprised at the plight of veterans.

□ 1430

When I talk about this portion of the budget, it is simply to show you that you must question the President, you must wonder what he is thinking when he not only cuts back on children and seniors and those that he promised to have a safety net for, but when he cuts

back on veterans and relegates them to homelessness and lack of health care, you have got to take a look at what we are doing and recognize this is the budget with the peace dividend directed to those who deserve it, this is the budget that says, "America, you owe it to our Americans to take that money that you don't need in the military anymore and insure that working men and women who have made the sacrifices," so aptly described by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] "are given an opportunity to have a decent quality of life." At the forefront of that line should be the veterans.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes to open the discussion on education as a priority in this budget for new world realities.

I do not think we can repeat too often the fact that this budget moves forward on the assumption that there is a peace dividend of \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion, to be realized between now and the year 2000. In other words, over the next 8 to 10 years we will save, by reducing the military budget, save a trillion dollars.

Now, we could use a part of that for the deficit. There is enough there to take a hunk for the deficit, to help lower the deficit; but we also very much need to use a large part of it for education.

Education has to be a priority. Education is the means toward the end for everything we do, including our national security. Education becomes the No. 1 item in our national security as we go forward toward the new world order.

The new world order is here already, it is in motion. The Japanese know this. Their superior education system has given them an advantage in the area of competitiveness.

The Germans know this. Everybody realizes the importance of education, but we do not seem to realize it.

The education budget in the last 10 years, the Federal share of the education budget, has gone down from 8 percent when Ronald Reagan took office as President to 6 percent now. Education has always been a local and State matter. We will not change that. But to have the Federal Government spending 2 percent less in 1992 than it spent in 1980 is a scandal, especially since both Presidents, both of our previous Presidents, have always talked about education as a priority. The present administration has made education a No. 1 priority. But we are talking about education without offering any resources.

We think that it is not unreasonable to claim at least one-fourth of the peace dividend, one-fourth of a trillion dollars over the next 8 to 10 years for education.

It was not luck that we won the gulf war, the war against Iraq, with a mini-

mum of casualties; it was not luck, it was a combination of years and years of research and development which produced the high-technology weapons that made that war a new kind of war, with a minimum of American casualties.

Mr. Chairman, it was not by accident that we got the Patriot missile. The Patriot missile cost a lot of money, not just to manufacture, not the tin, not the ingredients, the physical ingredients that went into it, but the research and development that went into it, the training of the people who operated it. Tremendous amounts of money had to be spent to reach that level of competence. It will be no less with education.

There are people who repeatedly say, "You can't solve problems by throwing money at them." Of course, you cannot solve problems just by throwing money at them; you also cannot solve problems unless you spend some money, unless you commit resources. Our refusal to commit resources to education shows that we do not understand what the new world order is to be all about. We can fall on our faces, as the previous speaker says, we can go over the cliff just like the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was a superpower yesterday, now it is no more. The bigger they are the harder they fall. And this Nation can fall, too, if we do not understand that behind every activity in this modern, complex society is education.

We are increasing the budget for education, not because we got some ideas off the street or we dreamed it last night; the increases that are proposed in this budget are based on some assumptions that have been gathered in from a number of different educational organizations. The increases are based on assumptions that will be clearly stated in a master plan that is being prepared by the educational brain trust of the Congressional Black Caucus right now for presentation to the full caucus within 2 weeks. It is a master plan for the improvement of education.

The administration has a master plan of a certain kind, called America 2000. America 2000 unfortunately is a public relations gimmick; it is a lot of talk, a lot of slogans, its mood is stated but there is not a single discussion of a budget in America 2000. So, it cannot be serious.

America 2000 seeks to jawbone the American people into believing that something is being done about education. In the meantime, while America 2000 is being sold to the rest of the country, we have never had such a tremendous number of cutbacks in local school districts all over America. The overwhelming majority of the school districts are being forced to institute tremendous cutbacks in their expenditures for education. The overwhelming majority of children in America today are going to schools which are inferior

to the schools they went to 2 years ago as a result of these budget cuts. There is no end in sight.

Now, it is always stated when you talk about education and budget cuts, that that is a local and State matter. You know, they act as if the Federal Government is annoyed at being presented with this dilemma of budget cuts across the country with respect to school boards and their budgets.

Education is as much as a national security matter as any other activity engaged in by this Government, and all of the funds of the Government come from the same place. There is no Federal money over here and State money over here and local money over there; it is all taxpayers' money. It all comes from the taxpayers at the local level, out of their pockets.

All we are doing when we say the Federal Government should have a greater participation in education matters is saying, "Give us back our money. Put the money back into the communities for education. At the same time, we will help the national security of the Nation."

We also assume in discussion of this education budget that it is not divorced from the concerns about our economy, which is sliding downhill. The economy needs some stimulus. Whenever people talk about stimulus, they act as if the only way to stimulate the economy is to build more bridges and highways and roads. That is ridiculous. You can stimulate the economy by having the Government interject money in a number of ways, and human services is one of those ways, and certainly education is one of those ways.

There is a lot of concern about the fact that we are going to move too rapidly and close down military bases and downsize the military and all those poor people are going to be thrown out of work in the defense industry and the soldiers will be thrown out of work. There is a whole lot of crying for people who have had it very good over the past 10 or 20 years.

They do not have to suffer. We can have a conversion program that takes care of the retraining of those people.

We have to understand, as far as our economy is concerned, every time we cut a defense job, every time we cut a job which is related to the military, we are creating more jobs in the civilian sector. To buttress this, I want to offer a study that everybody can get, anybody who wants to follow up and check the documentation for the statements that I am making. The study is entitled "Converting The American Economy: The Economic Effects of an Alternative Security Policy." It was published in 1991, it is current, by Employment Research Associates, of Lansing, Michigan. This is a study you can get.

It estimates that the net annual gain of 477,000 jobs could be achieved by cut-

ting the military budget outlays, starting at \$35 billion in 1991 and increasing to \$105 billion in 1994.

This study shows that for every \$1 billion in military cuts, 24,000 jobs are lost. For every \$1 billion, however, you pick up in the civilian sector 31,000 jobs, which means you gain 6,800 jobs for every billion dollars that is shifted from the military to the civilian. They give some concrete examples in the area of education. In education, in our military budget we do have pre-K teachers and K-6 teachers, and in that area we will lose 8,730 teachers in the military, cut from the military budget.

□ 1440

Teachers who are cut from the military budget, but we will gain 81,970. In the civilian sector, for a net increase of 73,240 teaching jobs, for prekindergarten to sixth grade. From 7th to 12th grade we will gain 39,270 jobs, and on it goes. Librarians, educational administrators; all these people have some equivalents who are employed in the military sector will be lost, but we gain many more for a total of 198,150 jobs in the education sector alone that would be gained.

The entire chart is as follows:

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC IMPACT FACTORS

A study entitled "Converting The American Economy: The Economic Effects of an Alternative Security Policy" published in 1991 by Employment Research Associates of Lansing, Michigan estimates that a net annual gain of 477,000 jobs could be achieved by cutting the military budget outlays starting at 35 billion dollars in 1991 and increasing to 105 billion dollars in 1994. This study shows that for every one billion dollars in military cuts, 24,000 jobs are lost; for every one billion dollars spent on civilian investments 31,000 jobs are generated. We thus gain 6,800 jobs for every billion dollars transferred from military spending to civilian investment. For education these projections show the following:

SAMPLE OF JOBS RELATED TO EDUCATION AND YOUTH

Category	Military jobs lost	Civilian gains	Net increase
Pre K and K-6 teachers	-8,730	+81,970	+73,240
7-12 teachers	-4,740	+44,010	+39,270
Post-secondary education teachers	-2,940	+11,230	+8,290
NEC teachers, counselors, institutions	-7,690	+44,290	+36,600
Librarians	-1,120	+4,640	+3,520
Educational administrators	-1,300	+7,850	+6,550
Social and recreation workers	-3,940	+34,620	+30,680
Total			198,150

NONPERSONNEL EDUCATIONAL ECONOMIC STIMULANTS PROJECTED

Category	Current annual Federal expenditures	Projected annual Federal expenditures needed
Public school construction (combined recommendations of the NEA, AFT, Carnegie Foundation and Education Writers of America).	Impact aid school construction—\$27,000,000. Asbestos hazard abatement—\$46,200,000.	\$6,000,000,000 (3 Sea-Wolf submarines) proposed Federal share is 1/2 of total needed.

NONPERSONNEL EDUCATIONAL ECONOMIC STIMULANTS PROJECTED—Continued

Category	Current annual Federal expenditures	Projected annual Federal expenditures needed
College/university construction (recommendations of Association of Physical Plant Administrators and National Association of Colleges/Universities).	Loans and grants to support construction and renovation—\$62,300,000.	\$3,000,000,000 (1 aircraft carrier) 1/2 of total needed.
DayCare/headstart facility construction (areas with the largest eligible populations presently lack adequate facilities).	None (Federal funds may not be used for construction).	\$1,000,000,000 (1/2 Sea-Wolf submarine).
Public library construction (American Library Assn. survey of 17 States indicate backlog of \$1,050,000,000 projection for 50 States is \$4,000,000,000 over 10 years).	Title II of Library Services and Construction Act—\$19,200,000.	\$500,000,000 (1/4 Sea-Wolf submarine).
Employment retraining facilities (massive program needed for economic conversion training).	None	No data available (most retraining programs presently conducted by local education agencies and private agencies).
Books for classroom use.	19 percent of chapter 2 block grant is spent for books—\$68,200,000.	\$1,000,000,000—\$20 for each of 50,000,000 pre-school and school age children (1/2 Sea-Wolf submarine).
Instructional video tapes (according to the Association of American Publishers the expenditures for audio-visual and other non-text materials was \$178,600,000).	No data available	\$1,000,000,000—an amount equal to the recommended book budget in order to update instruction methods (1/2 Sea-Wolf submarine).
Instructional and laboratory equipment (the Office of Technology Assessment estimates that only 4 percent of the total instructional time of students is spent using computers).	Office of Technology Assessment estimates in fiscal year 1987—\$186,000,000.	\$1,000,000,000 per year until ratio of 1 computer for every 3 school children is reached (1/2 Sea-Wolf submarine).

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to point out that to jumpstart the economy—to jumpstart the economy in the nonpersonnel sector let us look at what we will do if we start constructing schools. We have a backlog of school construction, and, if we spent, and these figures are taken from the NEA, the AFT, the Carnegie Foundation, and the Education Writers of America. We are presently spending in the Federal Government \$27 million on impact aid to school districts that are impacted under the Federal impact district.

A special hazard to debate, and also another \$46.2 billion for a total of \$68—I mean \$73 billion being put into construction and repair at this point by the Federal Government. We need about \$6 billion a year, and \$6 billion a year, by the way, is the cost of three Sea Wolf submarines.

Now I have heard people say we should continue to build Sea Wolf submarines because those people have jobs and we need to keep their jobs. That is a very expensive welfare program. To build weapon systems like Sea Wolf submarines is an expensive welfare program. Let us put them on the regular welfare and offer some jobs raking leaves.

There are some people who say that there are many jobs out there. My welfare recipients say they cannot find them. But, if they find the jobs, I am sure they are not going to pay the same wage they paid to build Sea Wolf submarines.

On and on it goes. College and university construction, day care, Head Start construction, public library construction.

I also want to point out that other groups like the National Citizens Commission for African American Education have made proposals that we come to the rescue of our schools right away. Let us not wait until the year 2000. There is a crisis in the schools right now.

We need a billion dollars for non-recurring immediate expenditures right now, for supplies, for equipment, to relieve the burden that our schools are faced with now.

We are talking about creating world-class schools in America 2000 without having a world-class delivery system. We are going to have world-class standards and world-class tests. We test the children to see if they measure up to the standard, but we do not provide the kind of schools, the teachers, the equipment that they need in order to meet up to those standards. We want to interject money right away. This budget will do that.

This budget calls for research and development, an initiative which is comparable to the problem. We should be spending about 1 percent of the total education budget, which is for the whole country. We are spending about \$360 billion in education, State, Federal, and local, which means about \$3.6 billion should be invested in research and development, if we followed what private industry does, an example set by private industry. We are spending less than \$100 million for research and development in education. There are initiatives that we should be taking which we ought to understand can only be taken if we transfer the money from the military budget into the civilian priorities, and education has to be one of those major priorities.

I close out by saying that in the budget it is hard to specifically find out what is happening with education. The Education Department cloaks their concerns and their priorities in fog. It is hard to find out what they are doing. They want to proceed with deals and want to intimidate people in the legislative branch to get what they want. It is never clear what they are doing, but we have some clear proposals that have been offered, and they are mentioned in this budget.

H.R. 4041 deals with research—4014 I mean deals with research initiative. There is another initiative which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON] will talk about later on. These are the concrete things that relate di-

rectly to the initiatives that are provided for in this new realities budget.

It is a new world order, Mr. Chairman, and we cannot go into a new world order unless we make education the very highest priority.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time at this point, and we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his excellent presentation and for his diligent work on shaping the Black Caucus alternative budget and the Progressive Caucus for their work to develop America's real strength, our human potential. I also congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for requesting adequate time to discuss this important budget.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I firmly believe that the economic and social structure of our Nation will crumble in the years ahead unless we reorder our priorities. Providing our young people with a solid education and with job skills is not just a lofty goal—it is absolutely essential if the United States of America is to remain competitive in a high-technology, global workplace.

We must ensure excellence in education at all levels from pre-school through graduate school. It is essential that we address the problems in the schools that are facing the greatest obstacles—our urban schools.

Every day when the school bell rings, America's urban children enter a world of fear and violence. The ideal of the classroom as a safe haven for learning and expanding horizons eludes the children of our cities.

Most recently, tragedy struck at Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn when a 15-year-old student shot two of his fellow students to death in the school hallway. Just 30 minutes before a scheduled visit from the mayor of New York, Mayor Dinkins was to take place.

Unfortunately, this was by no means an isolated incident. In fact, 50 young people have lost their lives in the neighborhood surrounding the school over the past 5 years.

Homicide is the second leading cause of death among adolescents and young people ages 15 to 24. On a yearly basis, about 1.8 million teenagers are the victims of violent crimes.

In order to solve the problems facing urban schools, we must also address the underlying social problems that young people in urban America face every day—violence at home and in the streets, inadequate housing and health care, and the abundance of illegal drugs in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, last fall a man by the name of Jonathan Kozol, who is an author and educator, testified about his visits to public schools around the Nation. His findings were contained in a book he wrote entitled "Savage Inequalities," which exposes the huge disparities in the quality of public education that American school children receive, depending on the neighborhood where they live.

He verified the substandard, and downright shameful, conditions in city schools. In contrast to their counterparts in the suburbs, urban school students do not enjoy modern equipment, a well-rounded curriculum, and nice surroundings.

In fact, Mr. Kozol found that the school in the south Bronx attended by Gen. Colon Powell has a barrel to catch water on rainy days. It has been there for as long as anyone at the school can remember. This is in a neighborhood where the rate of infant death is higher than in Bangladesh.

In East St. Louis, Martin Luther King Jr., High School had to be evacuated after sewage flowed into the kitchen.

In Chicago city schools, there is so much difficulty recruiting teachers that low-paid substitute teachers represent one-quarter of the teaching force, and each day, thousands of children come to school to find they have no teacher at all.

Mr. Chairman, we can certainly do better than this. In a country like ours, which has met so many challenges, which is leading the way in exploration of outer space, we can certainly upgrade these disgraceful conditions in our public schools.

Now that we are witnessing the end of the cold war era, let's channel some of our resources away from the military and in the direction of education. It seems to me that our Government's huge military build up of the past decade has in many ways made our Nation weaker, not stronger.

Valuable resources have been channeled away from the basic building blocks which have traditionally been the source of our strength—education, job training, housing, and community and economic development.

All American youngsters need to have some hope that if they persevere and finish school, they have a chance of securing a decent job. Because the United States is losing many of our long time sources of employment, such as manufacturing jobs, we also have to invest in retraining programs.

Our budget alternative would accomplish these goals through the following actions:

We would increase education block grants to the States by \$1.35 billion, and

We would provide first-year funding of the \$1.5 billion Urban Schools of America Act, H.R. 1669, at \$150 million.

This will assist urban local educational agencies in improving student achievement and meeting the national education goals established in this bill.

We would fund an at-risk youth, gang prevention initiative, at \$300 million;

We would increase higher education student financial aid by \$2.564 billion to enable more of our young people to overcome the financial obstacles to furthering their education;

We would provide \$73.5 million to improve and expand the Federal educational research, development, and dissemination capability as provided for in H.R. 4014;

We would increase our training and employment account (Job Training Partnership Act and Job Corps) by \$2 billion;

We would fund \$1 billion for economic conversion retraining associated with the military build-down; and

Finally, we would place Head Start on the path to full funding by fiscal year 1995 by providing an additional \$2.1 billion from current services.

Mr. Chairman, these are sound proposals which represent an attempt to rebuild America by fully developing the potential of our children and young people.

Statistics indicate that we have been failing to help our children achieve their full potential. Among American 13-year-olds, 27 percent cannot add, subtract, multiply, and divide using whole numbers; 42 percent cannot search for specific information, interrelate ideas, and make generalizations about text they have just read.

Even in schools in the top one-third of math achievement, only 10 percent of seniors are able to solve problems involving geometry, algebra, and beginning statistics.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot continue on this course if America is to retain its greatness. I urge my colleagues to think about the future, to think about the dreams that we had as youngsters and ask ourselves if today's children don't deserve the right to have those same dreams.

I hope that my colleagues will support this budget alternative to lift the expectations of our children and to restore strength to our Nation.

□ 1450

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my full support for the passage of the Congressional Black Caucus' quality of life budget, which we are considering today as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to House Concurrent Resolution 287, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1993. I want to commend the CBC chairman, ED TOWNS, as well as my friend and colleague, RON DELLUMS, for their endless efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor.

I rise also, Mr. Chairman, to encourage that my colleagues take a very close look at this alternative budget. We are not wasting time. We are not just going through the motions. We, here in the House of Representatives, are always full of rhetoric. We talk about the needs of children and families—everyone is in support; we talk about the needs of the elderly—everyone jumps on the bandwagon; and we talk about eradicating poverty—everyone signs on as cosponsors. I want to know why it is then so difficult to back up the rhetoric with strong support for a budget which reflects more clearly the values which the majority of our country hold.

The quality-of-life budget enhances proven social service programs while creating new initiatives especially in job training and education. The proposal most importantly modifies our Tax Code, ensuring fiscal responsibility to encourage deficit reduction efforts. Finally, the CBC budget promotes appropriate reductions in the military by eliminating unnecessary missile programs like the B-2 bomber and the Trident II nuclear submarine.

The CBC budget is fiscally sound, programmatically sensible, and morally right. It is a budget which shows that spending for crucial social programs can be maintained and increased where needed, while our national security does not have to be compromised. Most importantly, this alternative budget shows us that deficits can be reduced at the same time that we tend to the needs of this Nation.

As you make your decision today whether or not to support this proposal, please know that this is not a black budget, it is a human budget—a budget that is designed to reach out to those that are in need of some attention in this great Nation of ours. While we send our money worldwide in an attempt to spread democracy throughout the world, I implore you to support this budget today so that democracy can be spread right here in these United States to those who are being neglected, to those who are victims of poverty, to those with no health insurance, to those who do not have equal access to an education, to those who are hungry, and to those who are homeless.

Today, I would like to focus my comments specifically on two aspects of this resolution—education and jobs. In many ways the two issues are uniquely tied. I have always said that education is the key to truly moving this country forward. However, this Nation's education system is in crisis. Our children are not being prepared for the job market that awaits them.

The dropout rate for African-Americans and Latinos in high school in this country is astronomical. In my district, the dropout rate looms somewhere near 50 percent for public school

children and I am certain that other urban and rural centers suffer comparably. Despite minority enrollment gains over the years, little progress has been made in attempts to achieve parity in college participation. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I am concerned that slowly but surely a higher education is becoming a financial impossibility for the majority of all Americans.

I am pleased that the CBC budget heartily embraces the Urban Schools of America Act, H.R. 1669, which reinvests in this Nation's urban schools. Additionally, the resolution fully funds the Head Start Program by fiscal year 1995. As you know, Head Start provides critical services to disadvantaged youngsters, but sadly does not begin to serve the numbers that are eligible. Other provisions in the CBC budget provides funds for at-risk youth to keep them in school, and provides an increase in student financial aid for college bound students. Education must be one of this Nation's top priorities, and the CBC budget truly addressed this need.

There is no doubt in my mind that this Nation needs a national jobs program. It is my belief that everyone that wants to work should be able to secure a decent paying job. I have always believed that it is better to pay people to do work than to pay them to languish in unemployment. As you know, currently we are paying more and more people to stay unemployed. However, the workers of this Nation do not want to receive unemployment compensation, food stamps, or other forms of public assistance. They want a job and to be productive citizens. There are currently almost 9 million Americans unemployed. In my city of Chicago there are almost 9 percent unemployed workers in the metropolitan areas, and with the economic crisis in my district, I am certain that the number unemployed on the south side of Chicago is near 20 percent and growing.

Earlier this year, I introduced a jobs bill, H.R. 4122, the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act. This legislation provides funding for the support and training of the unemployed on local infrastructure projects. I view this approach as a critical component of the efforts to lift this country out of the current depression.

I am pleased that the basic premise of my bill has been incorporated in this year's CBC budget. Funds to create jobs for the unemployed should be a top priority. We must put Americans back to work and in turn make this Nation competitive once again.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to note that the CBC budget is premised on the need to break the budget agreement. It is time that Congress stop all of the rhetoric. We must substantially reduce the military budget to free up dollars to address this country's unmet domestic needs, such as jobs, edu-

cation, health care, housing, and crime. So, as I stand in support of the passage of this resolution, I, also, express my strong support for approving the Budget Process Reform Act, which we will consider next week. Last year's budget agreement is no longer an adequate blueprint for this country's economic future. Instead of continued emphasis on military spending at the expense of deserving domestic priorities, we should set forth a blueprint for reinvestment in education, health, employment, housing, and crime prevention programs. There needs to be an alternative direction for America that addresses real human needs and human potential by enhancing proven social programs and creating new opportunities in education and job training.

In closing, I want to thank my colleagues of the CBC for again answering the call of the people and accepting the responsibility of drafting this very important resolution. I encourage all of my colleagues, particularly those persons of conscience here in the Congress, to vote for the passage of the CBC fiscal year 1993 quality-of-life budget.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

□ 1500

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget alternative offered by my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus.

Since I began serving in Congress in 1973, I have looked forward to the moment when we could begin debating America's fiscal priorities without the specter of the Soviet Union complicating the debate. When we could ask how many mouths we can feed rather than how many missiles we could build. Yes, and when we could ask how many Americans we could teach rather than how many Russians we could kill. That day has finally come, but the President's budget is the same old, tired, warmed-over defense-oriented dribble of supply-side economics, which has so devastated this country, and more importantly has resulted in the under education of our children.

Well I am pleased to say that through the efforts of my good colleagues RON DELLUMS and ED TOWNS, and their staffs, we have been presented with a budget which recognizes who really lost the cold war. Certainly not the Russians, Mr. Chairman. The folks who are on the losing side are working Americans and their children, who footed the bill for the unconscionable defense buildup of the past decade and who have been tantalized by the prospect of a grand peace dividend, only to be once again let down by the President and his desire to stick yet another pin in his economic voodoo doll.

Today we have the opportunity to make a clean and distinct break with the past decade's misguided and miscalculated budget priorities, Mr. Chairman. We can once and for all repudiate the evils of Reaganomics and help all of those Americans—and they are a vast, vast number—who were so ill-served by the past two administrations.

You see, Mr. Chairman, my constituents on Chicago's west side aren't basking in the glory of the cold war victory, or Desert Storm. They are too busy licking their wounds inflicted by past Reagan and Bush budgets. Blacks and Hispanics served this country loyally and in disproportionate numbers in the military during the past decade, and now are being hung out to dry by George Bush and his alleged kinder and gentler America. And that's not all. Their little kids are being denied child care, their teenagers are not being taught the levels of math and science basics needed to compete scholastically with kids in other parts of the world, and their young adults are being denied a fair chance to receive a college education.

The Towns-Dellums alternative is the only budget proposal which truly recognizes the drastically reduced security threat to the United States posed by other nations, and realizes that the true threat to our national security is from within our own borders—from our own budget short-sightedness, as evidenced by the inferior education we are giving our children.

The CBC budget will reduce our military spending by over \$50 billion next year and reinvest those crucial funds back into America. Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say that we have to keep our guard up and our military strong. I don't argue that point. But, Mr. Chairman, what good is all of that expensive hardware going to be if there is nothing left here at home to defend? Our cities are in chaos, our children are malnourished, and our schools are underfunded, but the Air Force has a shiny new plane. Go figure.

I want to focus primarily, Mr. Chairman, on the plight of American education and how our children have been shortchanged during the Reagan-Bush era. As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness, I have the opportunity to work on legislation which affects how our firms compete overseas. Time and time again I have been told by business leaders that if there is one investment which could make American firms more competitive, it's education. If we can teach our children basic math and science skills, and assure that future workers are able to function in a modern society, American firms could compete in any market.

Unfortunately, the policies of the 1980's failed to realize this link, or at

least swept it under the rug in hopes that nobody would notice. Who can forget the "Education President's" call for full funding of Head Start? Yes, we read the President's lips and were duped by his apparent concern for America's children. But in 2 years he has not delivered on that implied promise to strengthen our education system. The CBC budget, however, delivers. It provides an additional \$2.1 billion for crucial Head Start programs for preschool children, and places it well on the way to full funding. The CBC budget increases aid to students of higher education by \$2.5 billion over current levels, and increases education block grants to the States by \$1.35 billion.

Our children are being robbed, Mr. Chairman, of their minds and of their futures. They are being robbed because this country values B-2 bombers more than it does A-plus grades. This alternative budget recognizes this travesty and acts decisively. In fact, this budget calls for nearly \$10 billion more than the President requests for all categories of education, including job retraining and employment programs to help dislocated workers.

I saw a bumper sticker on a car the other day which sort of sums up how out of touch our national priorities were during the 1980's. It said, "Let's put our defense budget into education, and make the Air Force hold a bake sale for a new bomber." Mr. Chairman, our schools are forced to sell cookies to survive, and that must change, and will change, under the CBC budget.

Mr. Chairman, our children are powerless to argue on their behalf. They have no voice, no strength, no vote, but it is upon them, who we will rely to carry this country into the 21st century. Let's give them the opportunity to reach their full potential through education. Let's not shortchange them with token increases in education spending such as the President proposes.

Education is not, however, the only priority to which this budget shifts some of our bloated defense budget. It addresses healthcare and infrastructure and veterans and housing. But education, I believe, is the cornerstone to the development of a new America. Just think what problems could be eliminated if our children only had access to information and educational resources. All of our country's major problems can in some way or another be traced to a simple lack of understanding and education. Drugs, teenage pregnancy, crime, racism, poor health.

We always hear how much it will cost to try and eliminate all of these problems through government action. Well, my friends, what will it cost if we don't? If we do not make some radical changes today, we will be well on our way to finding out.

I urge my colleagues to support this alternative budget.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is arguable whether the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 was ever rationally arrived at. But this much is not subject to argument. To arrive at the spending caps and firewalls which are its supposed genius, the question of what level of Federal expenditures is reasonably calculated to meet the needs of the Nation's people was never asked. No, the needs of the people did not drive the policy decisions represented by the Budget Enforcement Act. Rather, the question that drove the agreement was less rational, indeed it was an arbitrary one. The question was, without regard to the level of expenditures needed to meet the Federal Government's legitimate responsibility to the American people, what rules can we adopt that are calculated to reduce the budget and hold the line on Federal expenditures? Particularly was this true in the area of the education budget.

While the Federal Government has never had the full responsibility for the education of our people in this country, it has admitted of two overriding policy directions that belong particularly to it. The Federal Government has staked out for itself in the field of education, the responsibility to ensure access to education for everyone, that is to say, an opportunity to be educated, and to provide equity in educational offerings, that is to say, equal educational opportunity. Did these two policies drive the budget decisions in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990? I think not. These budget decisions that have affected education so negatively over the past few years, and that will continue to affect it in the future unless changed, were not policy driven, but purely deficit driven and therefore do not reflect a rational approach to reach the educational needs of Americans.

Adding to this problem, since the arbitrary and self-imposed budget agreement was enacted forbidding the transfer of savings from defense to domestic needs, the world has undergone a dramatic transformation. Just as the crumbling Berlin wall has become the symbol of this international change and progress, the crumbling of the so called budget firewalls that now prevent America from capitalizing on the peace dividend must become the new symbol of domestic change and hope for the Nation's future. It would be a shame if a half-decade of restructuring and the recent rapid change in the world, that the only response we as Americans can muster is to keep our rigid and outdated list of priorities in-

tact. This is not a response worthy of Congress nor the people it represents.

If we accept that the walls must come down, the question becomes what do we do with the peace dividend? Do we use it for deficit reduction or do we use it to address the domestic problems everyone agrees have reached cataclysmic proportions. The Towns-Dellums budget alternative gives us the only opportunity as between the alternatives before us to do both. In a recent New York Times survey 70 percent of Americans said that savings in defense spending should be retargeted to domestic needs. Another 30 percent said that it should be applied to deficit reduction. I concur with the American people, and so does the Towns-Dellums alternative. Now is the opportunity to realize the rewards of peace.

The Towns-Dellums budget alternative is responsive to the world we live in today. It provides a unique strategy for capitalizing on the peace dividend and an unparalleled opportunity to make the needed short- and long-term investments in our Nation's human resources. There is no other budget vehicle before us now that permits the investment in education that our Nation so desperately needs. Investing in higher education will help us to achieve our shorter term goals of putting skilled workers in the labor force and boosting the economy, while investing in education on the elementary and secondary levels will increase our longer term goals of sustained economic growth and competitiveness.

Over 30 years ago, President Kennedy stated that "only the well educated man or woman is equipped to work in an age of technology and to be a good citizen in an age of complexity." Our world is much more complex today than Kennedy could have imagined but his words ring even more true in present day America. We know beyond a doubt that an educated work force is vital if we are to have a high growth economy and a high skill, high wage work force. Today an individual with a college degree earns nearly three times as much as a high school drop-out. Postsecondary education is a high yield investment, and if there is one area in education where there is broad agreement, it is that America has the premier higher education system in the world. We know it works. We have more students enrolled in postsecondary education than any other major industrialized country. But over the last 10 years college costs have more than doubled, increasing twice the rate of family income. College is becoming less accessible to more students. The gap between family resources and college costs has steadily widened and the ability of Federal student aid to close the gap has steadily eroded. The aspirations of qualified students to attend college are being snuffed out. Access to higher education and equity in the

policies for which our Federal Government is responsible have been frustrated.

Seventy-three percent of Americans believe that a college degree is very important, but 87 percent believe that rising costs will soon place a college education out of their reach. The House Education and Labor Committee has put together a bill targeted to help students overcome financial barriers to higher education. The major way in which the bill does this is through an increase in the Pell grant. Today the maximum Pell grant award only covers about 25 percent of the cost of college attendance, when it was originally intended to be the foundation of student financial aid. What has instead become the foundation of student aid is the guaranteed student loan. The result of this shift from grants to loans is that middle- and low-income students now struggling to attend college have become a new generation of indentured servants. Since 1980, student indebtedness has increased 300 percent. The increased need to borrow has adversely impacted students' decisions to attend college and has contributed to the rise in loan defaults. And even worse, the rules on borrowing have priced many out of even this limited, often onerous access to higher education.

We have an excellent higher education bill that addresses all the vital issues such as costs, access, and minority participation in higher education; a bill that is prevented from coming to the floor because it breaks the outdated budget agreement; a bill that could be paid for through the Towns-Dellums budget alternative.

The best long-term investment we can make in this country is the education of those who will be our future workers, leaders, and scholars—the children in our elementary and secondary schools today. Our schools are failing our children, and no place is this more evident than in our inner cities. Today urban preschool children have half the access to early childhood development programs as their suburban counterparts. Teacher shortages are 2.5 times greater than in other school systems. The dropout rate in urban schools is 67.6 percent higher than either suburban or rural schools. The litany of other urban school ailments is familiar to us all: Low student achievement, illiteracy, teen pregnancy, violence, drug abuse, inadequate teaching materials, dwindling financial resources, and deteriorating facilities.

The quality of public education in the Nation's major urban areas has a direct effect on the economic development of our inner cities and will determine the country's economic competitiveness and academic standing in the world community. By the year 2000, one-third of the work force will be minority. Urban schools enroll 30 percent of the Hispanics and 40 percent of the

African-Americans that will comprise this work force. It costs America's businesses \$21 million each year to provide remedial education to high school graduates. Unless we act expeditiously, the problems facing our urban schools will become prevalent in all the Nation's schools.

The Towns-Dellums budget substitute would provide a funding opportunity for the Urban Schools of America Act which is targeted to help inner-city schools meet the demands of the future in several ways. First, the bill authorizes \$1.5 billion in formula grants to hard-pressed city school systems to fund local programs that help meet our national education goals and form partnerships with business and community groups. Second, it authorizes funds to repair aging urban school facilities, one-third of which are over 50 years old. Third, the USA bill authorizes \$1 million for research on urban education, and provides city schools with resources to strengthen their own capabilities. Under the USA bill school districts are given the flexibility to design programs that best meet their needs. The unique accountability measures ensure that schools demonstrate progress. The Urban Schools of America Act has been widely embraced. It has the support of 90 cosponsors in the House as well as 50 national organizations. The only factor preventing its movement through the process has been cost. Investing in our youth is how we make the peace dividend more than a catch phrase.

The Towns-Dellums budget alternative emphasizes the interrelatedness of education, jobs, economic prosperity, and a sound budget plan. As Americans we need to expand our notion of job creation. We seem to think that the only way in which jobs are created is when business can keep costs down, profits high and can afford to hire new employees. We must begin to understand, and to behave as if we understand that education creates jobs. It's through education that we produce the engineers and scientists that create the products and technologies that business in turn manufactures and sells. It is through education that we generate workers skilled enough to run our corporations and operate our computers. Jobs are not just created by investments in incentives to business, but through investments in education.

If the resources we devote to education is a fundamental test of our national vision, then our record on education of the last decade indicates that our vision has been clouded and our priorities need reordering. We need not today to agree that the Reagan-Bush administrations made a mistake by shifting precious resources away from domestic programs to the military to embrace the Towns-Dellums alternative. It is enough that we agree not to make a strategic error at this time

by refusing to reinvest in our human infrastructure through the approach of Towns-Dellums. I urge each Member of Congress to support this thoughtful and visionary budget alternative.

□ 1510

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to thank my colleagues, and more specifically, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], for giving this Nation an opportunity to have an option to what can be considered business as usual. It gives the Congress an opportunity to take another look at the position that we find ourselves in.

Not too long ago the President of the United States, in speaking before us in the State of the Union, in a most insensitive way, indicated that those that were ridiculing his capital gains tax cut in fact reminded him of someone that just stayed awake at night, worried that someone was having a good time.

It is true that the rich of this country for the last 12 years have been having a good time. They have been having a party, and they have been getting drunk off of tax cuts and tax loopholes, and the poor of this country have really had the hangover and the deficit.

It seems as though 12 years ago there was a design to take us back to where we were during the time of the Depression and before the New Deal, to make certain that the Federal Government will be out of housing, will be out of education, and out of those programs that we had taken for granted.

How was this done by the Reagan-Bush-Quayle administration? It was done in such a way as to dramatically reduce the 90-percent income tax from the Kennedy years to 28 percent, the corporate from 48 percent down to 35 percent, and we were led to understand at that time that by doing this we would broaden the tax base so local and State governments would be able to tax more, and that the priorities of deciding what the people really needed would no longer be at the national level but would be at the local level, and that we should rely on the private sector, our churches and nonprofit organizations, to fill this gap that opened when the Federal Government was removing itself.

I tell you this President has asked us to depend on a thousand points of light, but the President has not given us any batteries to work on. Because as a result of this Draconian cut in social services and the sharp increase in our military expenditures, we have seen the results of that with millions of people being turned out on our streets, our hospitals filled with people that have no health coverage, and so many people

without jobs and without hope that they have no alternative except to find something to ease their pain, and that something far too often has been alcohol and other narcotics.

Presidents will tell us just to say no. Other people would give us coloring books. Others would believe that the way we handle this is with the death penalty or to put more people in jail. But I tell you that as we look at the deficit that we have today we have to recognize that building in America is not just in bombs, it is not just in planes, it is not just in plants, it is not just in equipment. What makes a nation great are its people. That is what makes it great.

If we would take a look at people, we would find out that these people would rather warehouse people in jails rather than educate them in schools. When America, the land of opportunity, becomes a place that is known as a place that has more people in jail per capita than any nation in the world, including the Republic of South Africa, then it takes the Dellums-Towns budget to tell America to stop, let us take a look at where we spend our resources, let us see where we are going, let us make America productive, let us make America competitive.

The Office of Management and Budget, not the Democratic National Committee, the Office of Management and Budget says the drug problem is costing America in lost productivity, in lost revenue, \$300 billion a year. That is the kind of waste that keeps the deficit here.

But there is one way to beat it, and that is what is in this alternative package, to give our youngsters an opportunity to remain in school, to make the schoolrooms places of learning rather than having them be shooting galleries, to make certain when you arrest someone, arrest them to give them the opportunity to improve and to make some contribution to society.

To expose our children just to 10 or 20 years in jail, to offer them just the opportunity to be raped and abused, to return them to the general society worse than when they went in, if the jails are not really providing anything, since 70 percent of them are going to return in 3 to 5 years, then for God's sake, invest in the schools and not in the jails, invest in job training to make certain that these people can be productive and make certain that our drug treatment programs are not substitute drugs but substitute opportunity, and an opportunity to make a meaningful contribution.

What we have done in this budget is to try to bring some equity and fairness into the tax system, to make certain that those people that have gotten drunk at the party of tax reduction and tax preferences have a little equity in paying back; that we put a 10-percent tax just on the millionaires, and a 38-

percent tax on joint returns that are above \$225,000, and to bring some relief to the middle class, to reduce the Social Security burdens, and to increase in a small percent the corporate responsibility.

Bringing this equity, investing in people, means what? That the base that we broaden, and it is not just a tax base, we broaden in the opportunity for Americans to get an education, to participate, and to give back to this great Nation.

Those of us who are the recipients of the GI bill know what this means. We give it to the veterans of the Persian Gulf, but we also give it to all Americans to say that,

You shall not be denied an education. You shall not be denied health care, but you shall be given an opportunity to participate in this great Republic, the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

□ 1520

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues who have put together this very fine proposal.

The world is a radically different place from what it was just a few years ago. It will take bold steps to keep pace with these fundamental changes or we'll be left behind.

We face both historic opportunities and difficult challenges. The collapse of communism and the end of the cold war enable us to safely shift billions from nonproductive military spending to investments in our economy and our people. At the same time, we face tough economic competition from the Pacific rim and Europe, and after a dozen years of Reaganomics, we are burdened by a nearly \$4 trillion debt and weakened economic institutions.

This is the new reality we face and these profound changes require a dramatic shift in our budget priorities. Let's not waste time timidly tinkering with the status quo. It's time for a major overhaul.

Some will claim that we cannot find defense savings without compromising our security. They are living in the past. The fact is we are the world's only military superpower—the only nation that has the will and the ability to project military force anywhere on the globe. That will not change with this budget proposal.

What must change is the misguided notion that weaponry is the definitive instrument of national strength. As the world's only superpower, the threat to American security now rests in the threat to our international competitiveness.

Plans A and B would move us in the right direction, but they do not adequately reflect how fundamentally the world has changed requiring a fun-

damental reordering of our priorities, but plans A and B would find only 2 percent in additional defense savings when compared with the President's proposal. Two percent off a cold war budget is simply not enough.

The Black Caucus budget will eliminate weapon systems that have no role to play in America's future. The B2, star wars, the SSN21, and the F22 were all designed with the Soviet threat in mind. Our objective must be to maintain a strong conventional defense as well as the ability to deter any future nuclear power. This budget proposal will do that. It is clear that the bureaucrats in the Pentagon are sleepwalking, designing a military force designed to meet threat that no longer exist.

I want to add a brief note about our Nation's veterans. Under Reagan and Bush our veterans' health care facilities have been hit time and time again. The Towns proposals firmly reiterates that America must meet its commitment to our veterans.

This budget makes education a real priority—something the President and others talk about, but never follow through with when it comes to funding. It's time to look at education as a long-term investment in our future. It's time to make it a fiscal priority.

We cannot make the changes without looking for long-term economic gains rather than short-term political gains. This budget starts at the beginning by proposing a \$2.1 billion increase in Head Start funding—\$1.5 more than the President proposed. We all know this program works—that it helps prepare at-risk youth for a lifetime of learning—but we've been falling behind in our commitment to move toward full funding by fiscal year 1994. A sum of \$2.1 billion may sound like a lot of money now—but we know that for every dollar we invest today we'll save \$6 down the line.

But Head Start can't solve all of our problems. This budget follows through by increasing education block grant funds to States, investing in our urban schools, and funding intervention programs for at-risk youth. Money we invest at this early stage can mean the difference between these children becoming productive members of society, or taking resources from it.

Finally, this budget puts a priority on higher education by providing financial aid for students of all ages who attend trade and technical schools, colleges, and universities. It also invests in training and retraining programs for those who are trying to cope with a changing economy. Providing financial assistance to people who want to learn new skills so they can take advantage of new opportunities is money well spent. We learned through the GI bill that investments we make in these programs pay back in the form of higher revenue for years to come.

All Americans who are ready and willing to work hard for a paycheck have access to jobs. People are crying out for jobs—not for handouts. We need to provide them opportunities to help rebuild our country by investing in our infrastructure—roads, bridges, schools, and libraries. If people have the opportunity to work hard, they won't need to resort to welfare.

For the first time in over 50 years we as a Nation have a golden opportunity to refocus and redirect our priorities. No longer do we have to devote such a massive share of our national budget to protecting against a superpower rival. Instead, we can redouble our efforts in addressing some of the very real problems our Nation must tackle if it is to maintain its position as the pre-eminent world power. Only with the vibrant economy will we be able to maintain a strong and healthy middle class and expand that group to include a greater share of those Americans for whom the American dream has to date proved elusive.

This is a time of challenge. And, you know, we Americans respond to challenge. We're going to use our good old American ingenuity to put our country, our communities back on track; to inspire our kids to excel. The Towns amendment responds to that challenge to carry America into a new century. I urge its adoption.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time on this side of the aisle?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 1 hour and 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to admonish my colleagues that we have a list of about 15 or more Members who wish to speak in the remaining hour, and there are some Members who are not on the list who I would assume are coming over. So unfortunately, in this latter stages of the debate, we are going to have to limit our colleagues to approximately 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with that admonishment, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I just want to say I think the reason there is so much debate on this budget is we ought to stop and think about where we are. We turned down the gold standard budget yesterday. It only got 60 votes. Then came the President's budget. It got 42 votes. In any other country, the government would have fallen.

Now we are here. This is the third budget. I think the real name for this budget is the vision budget. We have a President who is on the ropes, and the amazing thing is there is no one even

in the ring with him yet. I think we have shown that by how we have dealt with the budget.

What this budget does, it admits to the American people that we became what President Eisenhower warned us about. We became a military-industrial complex. This budget shows us a way to reinvest and get this economy moving again.

We hear from the other side that these are big programs, this is welfare, this is everything. Let me remind Members that President Roosevelt never had a welfare program. He had a jobs program. This budget is in the true spirit of President Roosevelt, because it is talking about how to get people the skills to have those jobs, how we get industry the tax credits and the research and the development and the technology conversion so they can go forward with the jobs. This is a massive conversion bill and a skill-building bill.

To get this economy moving we know we have to have four things. We have to have the best education, and we do not have it. This budget works toward it.

We have to have the best technology. We only have it in defense. This helps us convert it to the other areas where people are buying it.

It says we must have the best infrastructure. We know we do not have it. But this budget helps us move toward getting it.

And we need flexible capital markets, and this budget helps do that and targets investment and gets jobs moving.

So what you do is you look at the end of the cold war and you say we must move to these areas where there is tremendous pent-up demand. To keep spending in the same old way is terribly inflationary and only, only spends lots of money and gets very little results for it, and does not get America ready for the 21st century.

I have been a supporter of the Black Caucus budget for a long, long time. It always has had the lowest debts, and the greatest vision. But this time more than ever it is desperately needed by this country as we see the cold war meltdown and when we have just finished a decade where economists tell us there were two choices in the 1980's. If you wanted to be upwardly mobile you should not have children because you could not be both, and something is wrong with that. We are really jeopardizing our future by this.

This is the way we get back on track. I commend everyone and urge a vote for this budget with vision.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I would say in response to the gentlewoman from Colorado, I think it needs to be pointed out that President Eisenhower would not be in any fear of this being a military-industrial budget. Only 19 percent of this year's budget

goes to defense. Back when Mr. Eisenhower was President it was well over 50 percent.

The gentlewoman says she has supported the budget because it has the lowest debt. Of the Democratic plan A with the fire walls up, and the President's budget and this budget, this budget has the highest deficit number, even though it makes dramatic cuts in defense.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am glad that the gentleman mentioned that, because what my point was was that Eisenhower warned us about all of our industry becoming military related, and I think every economist has pointed out that the difference between today and the end of every other war was we have had a much larger civilian-industrial base that people could job shift to. Right now we almost need to recreate that, because rather than moving to Texas to get the job they have to move to Tokyo.

Mr. SANTORUM. I agree with the gentlewoman. But I think one of the major things we have to do to build that industrial complex is to stop soaking up all of the money and spending it here in Washington and doing something about the deficit reduction so that we can put that money back into America to create that industrial complex.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think then that this is the budget for the gentleman from Pennsylvania because it has the lowest debt.

Mr. SANTORUM. No, no, it has the highest debt.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. And it moves us toward converting and getting those tax credits to people so that they can take the high technology base we have built in defense and in our Government labs that we are so proud of and transfer it into areas where we are making consumer products.

□ 1530

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, again, this is the highest deficit of any of the budgets being proposed, and it does nothing to put the money back into the hands of the small-business people that create jobs, and that is one reason I oppose it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am sure that the gentleman is a well-prepared Member of Congress, and I know that he read every single page of the Congressional Black Caucus

budget, and if he got to the last page, he would realize that in 1997 we take the budget deficit down to \$137 billion, which all people have indicated is a very conservative figure, because we put massive amounts of money into jobs, and when people work, they bring the deficit down even further.

I would suggest to the gentleman that in the 5-year view, we bring this budget deficit down further and faster than any budget presented. None of the other budgets project out to 5 years to the extent that we have and bring the deficit down, and I would just say to my colleague, first, that that is not true; second, I would say to him that if he looked at our budget again, we put several hundred millions of dollars into small business, into minority business, and just on its face, the gentleman's remarks are not true, and the document is there for him, read it, look at it. I hope at some point later in the debate the gentleman will stand and correct himself.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will look at the document. I have the document right here for me. It says very clearly when you look at total function in 1993, the deficit number is higher than the President's; it is higher than the baseline. I mean, that is all the predictions about what happens 5 years from now, let us go back 5 years ago, and project what the deficit was supposed to be this year, and we were supposed to be at zero deficit. Let us talk about what we know about for sure, which is what is going to happen next year. Those are the real numbers we have to deal with, and it is an increase in the deficit.

What I am saying is that we need to lower that deficit to allow private industry to be able to have the capital available to expand.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I will respond to the gentleman later at the close of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Black Caucus budget.

After spending \$11 trillion on defense, the cold war is over. We need new thinking, new ideas, a new vision. We do not need a cut-rate version of the same old thinking.

The people look to us today to provide this vision. The Black Caucus budget responds to their calls.

The Black Caucus budget knows that security begins at home. While the threat from the old Soviet Union has disappeared, the threats from within are growing every day.

Our neighborhoods are being killed by crack dealers, and haunted by the homeless. These are people left behind by the Reagan-Bush policies of the 1980's.

As Chairman PANETTA said yesterday, these budgets are not about numbers or figures. They are about people. Let's invest in the people, our people.

By reducing the military budget by 50 percent over the next 4 years, the Black Caucus budget frees up \$400 billion to meet our domestic needs. Four hundred billion dollars can make a real difference.

The Black Caucus budget makes a real difference in our neighborhoods by investing in community development.

It provides funding to fix our roads and improve our mass transit systems. And it devotes desperately needed dollars to build and improve housing opportunities.

The Black Caucus budget puts Americans back to work by investing in new job creation programs and job training. It pays for economic conversion programs to move people from the Pentagon assembly lines to jobs which produce real products to benefit us all.

The budget provides funding to heal our sick health care system. It pays for programs to make health care available to more Americans.

And it reinforces the fight against AIDS and drug abuse—the plagues of our age.

Most importantly, the Black Caucus budget invests in our future—our children. It increases funding for Head Start. It makes improvements in our sagging schools. And it invests in new programs to get at-risk kids off the streets and into the classroom.

Finally, this is not an antimilitary bill. We will still have the weapons we need to counter the threats of the 21st century. RON DELLUMS and I know that as members of the Armed Services Committee.

My colleagues, this budget has the right vision, it has the right focus. It provides the weapons we need to fight the real threat this country faces and helps meet the challenges of the next century. Vote "yes" on the Black Caucus budget.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of the cold war, we agreed upon the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, which mandates spending caps and budget walls between defense spending and discretionary domestic spending. However, today the cold war is over and the cold war budget is obsolete and the walls must come down. Today we are engaged in a war on the homefront: unemployment; inadequate health care; homelessness; failing infrastructure; and recovering from years of domestic cuts made in the Reagan-Bush administrations. Therefore, it is our responsibility as elected officials to enact a homefront war budget which reflects the real needs of this country's citizens. I believe the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget pro-

vides the appropriate response. It is time to break down the walls and take this opportunity to invest in this Nation's future through infrastructure, our children, and our economy.

I commend the President for acknowledging that due to recent world transformation, it is finally time to cut the bloated defense budget. However, in fiscal 1993, the President's recommendation for defense spending level is \$6.6 billion higher in budget authority and \$4.2 billion higher in outlays than the levels recommended in the committee's resolution's plan A and B. Even better, the Black Caucus recommends reducing fiscal year 1993 defense budget authority by \$49.6 billion and defense outlays by \$20.7 billion below the caps set in the budget agreement. The President's modest proposal is out of sync with the new world situation, especially in light of our current bleak domestic condition. In addition, because the President's proposal does not change the rules of the Budget Enforcement Act, there will be insufficient funds in the domestic discretionary to merely maintain fiscal year 1992 funding.

The Congressional Dellum-Towns Black Caucus has put together a budget which adequately addresses the needs of this Nation. The budget resolution is the first step in establishing the spending priorities of our Nation. It is imperative to remember that we are determining more than numbers, we are determining the future of this Nation and the fate of millions of human beings.

HOUSING

I firmly believe that this Nation must be resolved to end the deterioration in the quality of life for millions of Americans, especially in the area of housing. Further, as Federal Representatives, it is our responsibility to provide decent and affordable housing opportunities. The single greatest way to address our Nation's societal ills is through the implementation of a sound human investment policy which has as its centerpiece the provision of safe, decent and affordable housing for all Americans. Proper housing provides more than shelter, it provides the stability and environment necessary to enable learning to take place, and for people to establish a sense of community.

Since the early 1930's, when this country faced the Great Depression, the Federal Government has played a role in meeting housing needs. Until 1981, this role grew rapidly, as did the bipartisan consensus supporting it. This Federal role existed because the leadership of this country realized that the Government should be involved along with the market to meet the affordable housing needs of all the Nation's people. Somewhere along the way, however, priorities changed and thus today, after 40 years of Federal

housing programs, for each low-income household living in subsidized housing, there are three others who need housing assistance but can not obtain it. Further, since 1970, the cost of housing has risen four times faster than income.

The past two administrations and their budgets have largely accepted and acted upon the assumption that there is simply no way to adequately meet our low-income housing needs. The housing conditions of this country are too important and too demanding to cut community development and affordable housing programs by more than 16 percent from the 1992 levels, as the President proposes. Further, to fund housing programs for a prolonged period without properly addressing housing needs serves to make a bad situation worse. The assumption that there is simply no way to meet our housing needs is a self fulfilling prophecy unless we make a commitment to provide the necessary funds. By doing so we would begin to provide adequate housing, especially low-income housing. I am pleased that the alternative budget proposes \$5 billion for low- and moderate-income housing construction and rehabilitation grant program.

We can no longer allow further disinvestment to occur in our neighborhoods, communities, or the increasing loss of affordable housing stock and the exclusion of poor and middle-income working people from housing and vital human services. If we allow for unabated decay to the infrastructure of our society, we will have no base upon which to build lasting economic development. If we can spend over \$160 billion to bail out the savings and loan industry, we can surely make a sufficient, sound and long term investment in this country's community and infrastructure development. We need a healthy and productive population to develop the economic prosperity that we so desperately desire to our world wide competitiveness.

I believe the Progressive budget makes a serious attempt to provide adequate shelter for the million households on waiting lists for housing assistance and the 100,000 children who are homeless today. It is disgraceful that in America two million people sleep on the streets each year. With hundreds of homeless people huddled on sewer grates in the Nation's Capital and in the White House's backyard, I don't understand how the President can eliminate programs such as the Emergency Shelter Grant Program, which since 1986, has provided assistance to more than 2,000 shelters around the country, by more than 75 percent.

Today we must consider the long term effects of this budget resolution vote. We must enact legislation with priorities which remembers the millions of hidden, invisible Americans in the dark and into a temporary shelter,

out from under bridges, in cars, abandoned houses or homeless shelters to the daylight of promise and hope, supported by the funding necessary to make our dreams for America a reality. We must give all of our children a chance to learn. We must bring all of our people out of the Third World existence that they have been relegated to inside the wealthiest Nation on Earth. I believe the budget for new world realities and for rebuilding America is the budget which reflects this goal.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I stand before you today to share my concerns and thoughts about the economy and how the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget for fiscal year 1993 would impact upon it.

Mr. Chairman, this country is presently in a bad state of affairs, whereby right before our very eyes as if a magic show were being performed by David Copperfield or the Great Houdini, the American dream is turning into an American nightmare. What is most distressing, Mr. Chairman, is the story about John Doe who has worked for more than 30 years on the same job as an automobile sales person in an automobile plant.

On Monday, in a lively manner, whistling as usual, John reaches for his time card to clock in and, instead, to his amazement, he finds a pink slip that provides him with little, if any, notice that due to the recession, the auto plant is being forced out of business. For the balance of the day, John's major thought of the day: "This has to be a nightmare for this really can't be happening!"

John wonders to himself: "Where will I get the dignity and still be able to face myself in the mirror after I tell Mary that I've lost my job after so many years and all that I have done for that company?" Less than a year later, John has lost his wife through divorce because he is perceived by Mary and members on her side of the family as a husband incapable of providing support for his family; the mortgage on his house has been foreclosed.

His car has been repossessed because of his failure to tender car payments. For anyone who is interested, John can be found in the shelter for the homeless along with countless others who are similarly situated; however, he is no longer wondering whether what he experienced just 3 months ago was a nightmare or reality; John is literally living a nightmare. Mr. Chairman, this is a sad but true account of what our Nation is faced with this very instance.

Let me say then, Mr. Chairman, that any measure which stimulates the demand to combat the recession and, at the same time, addresses the econo-

my's slow growth is the right policy. Mr. Chairman, this is an argument for rapid action, not inaction.

That action demands that we set a new course upon which our Nation must travel—a course which recognizes more compassionately and comprehensively our past failures in alleviating the pain of those who, like John Doe, suffer from homelessness, illness without access to medical care, frustrated educational opportunities, drug abuse, violence in the community, and economic collapse.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative fiscal year 1993 budget for new world realities as the CBC alternative seeks to promote the economic growth and vitality of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC has worked hard to present a budget that would establish military spending at levels sufficient for our national security, that would maintain our national tradition of progressive taxation, that would provide adequate funding for important social programs, and that would have the lowest budget deficit projections of any of the various budget proposals.

This proposal, Mr. Chairman, comprehensively responds to the administrations' past and present failures to combat the harsh actuality of poverty, unemployment, homelessness, and economic insecurity. Mr. Chairman, the CBC's plan takes advantage of the window of opportunity that new world conditions offer for serious cuts in military spending.

The Congressional Black Caucus has worked to find progressive solutions to advance the cause of human dignity and social advancement. Mr. Chairman, this plan deals honestly in its appraisal of all of our contending national needs and professes the wisdom to resist the easy course.

Mr. Chairman, the economy of this country is suffering. In reality, many go to bed at night and wake up the next morning to find that after 30 years, the ordeal of the previous night's slumber is actually real. The CBC has firsthand knowledge of many such instances and recognizes fully that, today, Americans are losing their jobs in greater numbers than any time since the Great Depression.

This is simply unacceptable for my constituents, and others across the country. That is why my colleagues and I in the Congress must act now to save American jobs and lead the way to sound economic recovery for all people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, jump starting the economy by cutting taxes is one way out of the economic muddle. Cutting personal income taxes—by decreasing rates or increasing the personal exemption—will allow Americans to keep more of the money they earn. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that much of that money will be used to make purchases

that have in the past been delayed by hard economic conditions.

At present, the purchase of new homes, cars, refrigerators, VCR's, and other things of this nature have been put on hold. The idea I mentioned previously, I feel, will revive ailing industry, and it will, in turn, increase orders to manufacturers, who will hire additional people to meet the rising demand.

What's more, Mr. Chairman, we make substantial steps in the right direction by accepting the realization that for every dollar spent excessively on military-related matters, that same dollar could have been spent to rebuild our bridges so that people of this country can be removed from the potential risk of harm they might otherwise suffer from an unattended collapsing bridge.

Those wasted military dollars would be better spent on the enhancement of the educational system of this country which at present is an embarrassment even when compared to those Third World countries thought to be primitive in their thinking and technological progress.

Mr. Chairman, at the very least, some of the wasted funds could certainly be utilized to provide free school lunches for students whose parents are indigent or otherwise financially incapable of providing lunch money for them.

Indeed, every weapon system that we do not need but which we continue to fund will rob our citizens of their health care programs, our Nation of the opportunity to ensure that we can feed, clothe, and care for those who are homeless in our midst.

Mr. Chairman, a recent news article stated that, "[W]hile Democrats used to target their message to the poor and the underprivileged, they now are striving to appeal to the middle class."

The article proceeded further to recognize my commitment to champion the cause for the poor during my tenure in the U.S. Congress just as I did in the Philadelphia City Council. The sad thing now, Mr. Chairman, is that the so-called working class has now become the equivalent of the poor and we have witnessed the destruction of the working class.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of that commitment that I made to the poor upon taking public office that I unequivocally support the CBC alternative budget whereby the hope of decent affordable housing for Jane Doe is not an impossible dream and it is not an impossible dream to rehabilitate recreation centers across the country making them more appealing for our youth so that they can choose between hanging out on the streets getting into trouble or engaging in some form of constructive activity.

To that end, Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the relief offered by this alternative proposal will foster long-

term enhancement of our Nation's productive capacity, including job creation, education, training, research and development, and many such measures.

Therefore, I agree and support the Congressional Black Caucus' proposal which instructs that we significantly reduce military spending to levels which match our new national security needs, reinvest these newly available resources on our education, infrastructure, health and other urgent needs, and provide tax equity by redistributing the wealthy's tax breaks to the working and middle-class taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, America is in deep trouble. No doubt, the CBC alternative budget will help to straighten out that trouble—not only for Afro-Americans, but for Hispanics, Asians, Caucasians, Indians, and people of all color. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Congressional Black Caucus fiscal year 1993 alternative budget.

□ 1540

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, a year ago at this time we had the most popular President in American history with a 93-percent approval rating, better than the high water marks of FDR. At this time last year, the President submitted a budget calling for in excess of \$300 billion worth of deficit.

Now, the reason why I am bringing that up is that I want to say today that the greatest sin in the history of the White House was that small room of advisers that looked at that President and said, "With this great popularity, don't muddy the water. Just go in there and submit a budget, Mr. President, because you will be re-elected."

Well, let me tell you what, it is a new ball game. That mistake cost this country our future. Had he submitted one that would have moved us toward discipline and said, "Congress, give me your figures," we would have been moving off today in the right direction today, but we are not.

Any one of these budgets will probably hit \$500 billion worth of debt next year, a half a trillion dollars. I am only going to vote for one.

I want to congratulate the Black Caucus, because at least within this management of debt scenario, they try and develop a people's program for our country.

What is left, Mr. Chairman? What bothers me, we still do not do anything about foreign aid. I want to take \$7 billion from foreign aid—I want you to listen to this, I want the help of the Black Caucus, and I want to reprogram \$4 billion to revenue sharing for cities and counties and \$3 billion for our schools, with a 10-percent advantage to inner city schools.

If you are telling me you do not have the money, I am going to buy it. I am not going to try and rewrite your budgets. I am going to try in the appropriation process to take \$7 billion from overseas and put it back home.

I congratulate the Black Caucus. The Iron Curtain has turned into a vegetable strainer. The Berlin Wall is a speed bump, and we are still fighting unnamed Communists.

Thank God, there is some sanity here. I would wish that most Members would look carefully at all the budgets and look at the people element in this budget.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, with the changes we are seeing in the Communist bloc countries in Eastern Europe, most of my constituents in western and central Illinois really wonder why the President wants to continue to spend massive amounts of money to maintain massive troop deployments in Germany and to build weapons systems that were designed to counter a Soviet threat. With the withering of that Soviet threat, I believe we can, as many of the speakers have proposed, reinvest in America, in education, workers' retraining, infrastructure improvement, and veterans' programs, and it is on veterans' issues that I would like to focus.

Tonight, perhaps as many as 250,000 veterans will be homeless in our country, and twice that many may be homeless sometime this year. The people who survived the desert war in Southwest Asia or the jungles of Southeast Asia now find that they have to fight the war on the brutal streets of the homeless in America. This means that veterans comprise about one-third of the homeless male population in our country, and yet veterans only receive about 5 percent of the money that is allocated for homelessness under the Stewart-McKinney Act.

Now, I do not want to see a redistribution of those funds. I want to see an increase in those funds, because even the program that we do have that are not targeted to veterans do help veterans and we need to increase that commitment.

We have also seen the deterioration of the VA hospital system programs, both for the service-connected and the nonservice-connected veterans who have to use that system, people who have gone to the VA for decades, many of them, people who for the most part do not have health insurance and they have had continuity and care from the VA providers for quite a long time.

The major veterans' organizations are starting to recognize the problems that they are facing. Chairman TOWNS of the Congressional Black Caucus received a letter from one of the major

veterans' organizations, the Disabled American Veterans, which Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS put into the RECORD, but I want to read a paragraph or two from the letter, which goes on to say:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1992.

Mr. EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TOWNS: On behalf of the more than 1.3 million members of the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) and its Ladies' Auxiliary, I take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Congressional Black Caucus for your recognition of the critical funding needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

As you so aptly stated in your Fiscal Year 1993 Alternative Budget, "During the decade of the '80s, veterans' benefits were reduced significantly, in a real sense breaching the commitment the nation made to veterans as a recompense to their willingness to risk life and limb for country. These cuts have impacted many veterans in dire ways, particularly as regards to their health care needs."

We in the DAV know first hand how difficult it is to obtain quality VA health care and benefits delivery in a timely fashion. Our members continue to be subjected to nine-month waits for clinic appointments; delays in receiving medications and medical supplies; closed access to medical care because of staffing and equipment shortages; busy signals when calling the VA for benefits information and assistance; long delays in the adjudication of benefit claims; and the inability to receive vocational rehabilitation at the time it is most needed.

The \$3.25 billion increase over the President's request for VA benefits and services in Fiscal Year 1993, called for by the Congressional Black Caucus, will go a long way toward improving the quality of VA health care and benefits' delivery deserved by our nation's service-connected disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors. Truly, the Alternative Budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus for Fiscal Year 1993 demonstrates, in a most meaningful way, its commitment to our nation's veteran population for their sacrifices in defense of this great nation.

Again, Chairman Towns, I thank you and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for your efforts in recognizing the critical funding shortages in the Administration's Fiscal Year 1993 VA budget request.

Sincerely,

CLEVELAND JORDAN,
National Commander.

Another major veterans' organization, the American Legion, sent each and every one of us in Congress a letter, while not specifically endorsing this budget proposal, expressing its deep disappointment over the two budget resolutions. The letter reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 3, 1992.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion is deeply disappointed over the two budget resolution options now pending in the House. Both of them—characterized individually as Plan A (invest defense savings) and Plan B (stay within the walls)—absolutely ignore the needs of the nation's veterans.

At this time last year, our entire nation was breathing a collective sign of relief that the Persian Gulf War was over. While most of the nation was planning for "welcome home" ceremonies, many congressional members were beginning to look for ways to spend the expected "peace dividend". It's now obvious that those men and women who achieved the peace through their devoted military service and personal sacrifice are near the bottom of the list of dividend recipients.

Even Plan A, the option designed to invest defense savings, would allocate only 2.5 percent of the projected savings total to veterans programs. Of the 13 domestic program recipients under that plan, 8 of them would receive more of the defense savings than veterans programs.

Hundreds of thousands of men and women are now being forced out of the military into a stagnant job market, and there is recent evidence that even Persian Gulf War veterans are among the nation's homeless. Despite these circumstances, Plan A would use defense savings to dramatically increase Pell Grant educational assistance while doing virtually nothing for veterans who are GI Bill participants. The same option would provide almost \$2 billion for expanded WIC and homeless services, but it recommends no money for VA's already-strapped homeless programs.

The American Legion urges you to take advantage of this opportunity to rearrange the nation's domestic budgetary priorities and, in so doing, to support the principle that veterans have the first claim to any savings attributable to a "peace dividend".

Sincerely,

DOMINIC D. DiFRANCESCO,
National Commander.

So Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for bringing the Congressional Black Caucus budget to the floor today.

Repeatedly, the administration's budget proposals have revealed with an uncanny clarity that the President simply does not understand the many problems facing American people. In recent months, we have witnessed the end of the cold war and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. These developments have made it possible for us to refocus our energies on domestic issues, such as employment, health, housing, and education. However, rather than seizing on the opportunity to address the special needs of poor and middle class persons, the administration proposes to serve us another plate of warmed-over Reaganomics. Our economy is struggling with a recession. In the inner cities of many States, we are in a depression. The President's proposal fails to address the current dismal economic state of affairs confronting our Nation, including increased unemployment and poverty. Human life and quality of life issues continue to go unanswered.

The Bush budget would fund domestic discretionary programs at roughly the same spending caps set by the 1990 budget agreement. Reductions in defense spending would be a nominal \$4.8 billion and entitlement programs such as Medicare would be cut by more than \$32.2 billion over a 5-year period.

Mr. Chairman, while the resolution proposed by the House Budget Committee is a vast improvement over the President's budget, it is the opinion of the Congressional Black Caucus that more can be done—that more needs to be done—that more must be done. Briefly, the CBC proposal will reduce fiscal year 1993 defense budget authority by \$49.6 billion and defense outlays by \$20.7 billion below the caps established by the 1990 budget enforcement agreement. The substitute also calls for tax relief for middle- and working-class families that would be paid for by tax increases on the wealthy and corporations. As a practical matter, enactment of the substitute will require enactment of legislation to eliminate the firewalls established by the 1990 budget agreement, so that savings from defense spending can be used to meet domestic needs.

In the areas of health and human services the elimination of these firewalls is paramount. According to the children's defense fund, more than 13 million American children live in poverty. Fewer of our children are vaccinated against wholly preventable diseases than in the past. For immunization of nonwhite children, the United States now lags behind 59 other countries, including Albania, Botswana, and Jamaica. In 1990, more than 40 percent—a total of 25 million—under the age of 18, lacked employer health coverage, even though more than 85 percent of all children lived in working families.

In addition to these trends, African-Americans and other minorities suffer an estimated 60,000 excess deaths annually. This disparity is even more alarming when we include in this discussion the numbers of African-Americans who are uninsured. African-Americans and Hispanics have accounted for 55 percent of the increase in the number of Americans added to the rolls of the uninsured between 1977 and 1987.

The CBC alternative would address these issues by providing: First, \$10 billion for health care services to those who are without health care coverage or the means to secure health services; second, \$250 million for drug-abuse education and prevention; third, \$1.1 billion for HIV/AIDS research; fourth, \$500 million for aids treatment; fifth, \$500 million for preventive and dietary health education; and sixth, \$1.5 million for Federal research agencies minority scholarship and loan repayment program.

In addition to these initiatives, the CBC substitute will provide substan-

tially more funding in the areas of education, community development, transportation, job training, the environment, and the reduction of gang-related violence. Social Security and Medicare would be maintained at current service levels.

Mr. Chairman, in addressing the many issues facing this country, particularly the concerns of those in need of jobs, health care, education, and training, this is a time for confrontation, not retreat. The Congress is obligated to pick up the gauntlet the President has ignored, and exhibit the willingness and wherewithal to meet these challenges. The CBC alternative does what the President has failed to do—produce a budget which addresses the real needs of our Nation.

I am proud of the Congressional Black Caucus for the leadership it is giving to the Congress on this issue and I urge all of my colleagues to support the CBC alternative.

□ 1550

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman for yielding this 3 minutes to me.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago when I contemplated running for Congress and returning back here to address the issues of the Nation, I dreamt of this opportunity to come to the well and to discuss in a meaningful way possible funding of all the programs the people of this country aspire to, but until this moment have always felt there were other priorities, other issues that always overtook their concerns.

For the first time since I have been here, having the opportunity to debate this alternative budget presented to us by the Congressional Black Caucus, I feel a sense of inspiration that there is something to look forward to, that all the people out there that write to us and agonize over the failures of our educational system, over the deficits of our health system, of the agony of the homeless, of the people who need housing and all the other assistance programs in our country, not to mention the millions today who are unemployed, for whom a job prospect is the wildest possible dream that they could have tomorrow. I hesitated a few days ago to vote for the tax alternative because it seemed to me that the words on a piece of paper that directed itself to the long view in the future, the trickle-down impacts of a tax bill, did not address the question of jobs tomorrow.

I look to this budget process as the opening wedge opportunity for all of us to finally look to the American people and say that jobs is what the budget process is all about, jobs and a building of the internal national security of our programs, built upon a confidence in

our educational system. That is what the Congressional Black Caucus has presented to us.

We know perfectly well that the world has changed in the last 2 years and that it is perfectly legitimate to talk about building down our defense budget by a mere \$50 billion when we are allocating \$300 billion, and to take that \$50 billion in a very modest way and to put that back into a jobs program and an education program and a training program and a housing program and a health program makes all the sense to me.

In my own committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, I thought: "Well, in my way I would like to fund about \$5 billion each year for the next 5 years in educational programs."

This budget, I am so pleased to say, comes up with nearly \$10 billion in education programs, \$1 billion in education block grants, \$2 billion in Job Corps, \$2 billion in Head Start and \$1.2 billion for the GI bill of rights.

These are the measures that expand opportunity in our country and build a lasting foundation for jobs and employment and internal security, which is what the budget process ought to be.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke last evening against the President's budget, and I rise today to say that the budget offered by the Democratic Budget Committee is marginally better than the President's with respect to deficits, but it is still sadly out of touch with what is needed to seriously address the budget crisis in this country. I'm going to vote no.

It is more than a little frustrating to be a part of Government today when we have a President who offers no leadership to reduce these crippling budget deficits, and when Congress is content to quibble over shades of small differences in budgets that don't really deal with these same crippling deficits.

Let me be clear. My criticism is aimed at both sides. We have a President who is charting a dangerous fiscal policy, and we have a Congress without the courage to confront the President and without the courage to stand up and prescribe strong medicine to put this country back on track. It is one thing for the President and Congress to make honest mistakes. But it is another thing for the President and the Congress to deliberately ignore the danger of a fiscal policy that I believe will cripple this country's economic future.

Let me be clear about the size of the deficits we are discussing. This year the deficit is expected to be about \$473 billion. In the President's proposed budget, this year and the coming 5

years we will see budget deficits totaling \$2.21 trillion. At the end of 1997, we will have a Federal debt of \$6 trillion which will saddle our children and their children with a burden that they cannot overcome. I did not vote for the President's proposed budget, and I will not vote for the Budget Committee's budget. Both are out of touch with reality.

Is there a better way? Of course. It requires political guts, and it requires leadership. We could decide that we will not accept deficits totaling a billion dollars a day—every day for 6 years. We could decide to force a reconciliation in this country about what the American people want from their Government and what they are willing to pay for. We could decide that we are not going to pay for our allies' defense anymore, and save nearly \$100 billion a year. We could decide to be serious about waste in the Federal Government, and Lord knows there is plenty of it. And we could start tackling deficits and waste as aggressively as we wage turf battles here in Congress, or do battle with the executive branch of Government.

The fact is the American people don't respect this Government because we are unwilling to offer bold solutions and take bold action to put this country back on track.

Yes, I understand there are some people in this country who send conflicting messages to their public servants. They want all of the spending programs, and they also want lower taxes, and the deficit reduced at the same time. It can't work that way. We need to decide to pay for what we spend. We need to ask two questions about public spending. Do we need it, and can we afford it? If the answer in either case is "no", then we can't keep spending.

I came to Congress believing I could make a difference, and wanting to change public policy in a number of areas. I still believe I can make that difference. If I didn't believe that, I wouldn't have the energy to wage the fights in public policy in which I am involved. But the institution of government is becoming too big, too wasteful, and too difficult to change. The American people are justifiably angry, because every time they turn around, there is another idiotic rule or regulation that stems from a well-intentioned law. There is another item of public spending that on its face seems totally unjustifiable. And there is inertia to virtually everything Government does that protects itself and resists change. I am as frustrated and as angry as most Americans about where we find ourselves and where we are headed, and I will not participate in business as usual. I will not vote for budgets or appropriations bills that continue down the road we are now on.

I have only one vote here in Congress, but with that vote, I demand a

change. I demand leadership from the White House and from Congress to face facts, to sober up, and to develop a plan for this country's future that thinks big, and gives America a chance again.

Yes, I want to be one of those who supports investments in America. I see a hundred things that need to be done, and the sooner the better. But, just like a family or a business, or county, or a State, this Government cannot invest money it does not have. Investments come from savings, and savings come from an account that reconciles income with spending in a manner that produces the extra money available for investment.

Ogden Nash wrote a little four line poem that can probably be used as a metaphor for the President and Congress on fiscal policy. The poem is about a man who drinks too much, and a woman who nags. It goes:

He drinks because she scolds, he thinks.
She scolds because he drinks, she thinks.
And neither will admit what is really true.
He's a drunk, and she's a shrew.

We need to understand that we're all responsible for this problem. I am convinced that if enough of us say no, that we won't accept business as usual, that we won't accept \$2 trillion in additional debt, then we can change things. I am convinced that this country has its best days still ahead of it. If only the President and all of us in Congress will stand and exhibit some courage to change the way things are done here in Washington, then we will put our country back on track. That we will and that we can do that is my hope. We need change, and we need it soon.

□ 1600

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the assumption, the conclusion, that one might draw casually listening to the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is as if the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus are ignorant to the points the gentleman raises, and I know the gentleman, and I respect the gentleman, knows full well that is not the case. We have attempted to address the issue of the deficit. We said in an 8-year period there is a trillion dollar peace dividend.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to enter into a discussion with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], or any Member of this Congress, to figure out how much of that \$1 trillion over an 8-year period in cash money we should contribute to the deficit. I am prepared to do that. We have said that on the record, for the record, in the RECORD.

Second, we are saying that one of the factors that contribute to the deficit is the recession itself. Our approach at-

attempts to take us out of the recession. I say to the gentleman, "If you have a legitimate intellectual and political difference to us on how to do that, then I can respect it. But we've attempted to address the issue of the deficit and probably have tried to do it with more direction than anyone else."

Just one additional point on the deficit. The gentleman and I both agreed that one of the major contributing factors to the deficit is the skyrocketing cost of health. The gentleman knows that, and this gentleman knows that. We are spending in excess of \$800 billion. Costs are out of control. Most people have indicated that, even if we found the trillion dollars in peace dividends, and we do not get a handle on health care costs in this country, all that money could be soaked up just dealing with that aspect of it. So, when the gentleman talks about the deficit, we also have to deal with all aspects of it. We attempted to do that.

Finally, I would hope the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] would not be saying to me what has been said to me for 21 years: We want to solve the social and economic problems, but we are fighting the Soviet threat. Now I hear us saying we want to solve the social and economic problems, but it is the deficit. So, has the deficit now replaced the Soviet Union as the threat, or would the gentleman enter into a balanced approach of some money to the deficit and some money to the priorities of the country, and I am sure he will.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and he knows that my feeling is that he is not ignorant of any of these points. That was not my intention to suggest that.

This is not the deficit we were talking about 5 or 8 years ago. This is a 500-pound gorilla. We are talking about deficits of enormous proportions, and my colleagues know that it is interesting that every year I have been here the same discussion ensues about the deficit. It is the sort of discussion he said, "Well, we'll discuss it later, about whether we're able to make this investment in human potential." It is always that we will discuss later what we will do about the deficit.

The problem is the deficit this year we are in is going to be \$473 billion. The projection is, under the administration's budget, and to a lesser extent on the other two budgets, spending \$1 billion a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year for 6 straight years, ending with a \$6 trillion debt.

Now I am telling my colleague in my judgment this country will not get well with that kind of a fiscal policy. Some way, somehow, someone, someday has to stand up and change it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] for his generosity.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for the last 6 hours I have been detained in a closed session, in a meeting of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in a matter of great importance that has reached some sort of consequence. As a result, I was not able to be here to participate in this debate. I support wholeheartedly, and I have worked toward the passage of this budget by the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus' quality of life alternative budget. Having just returned from the streets of my congressional district, I can attest first hand that the citizens of my State are being severely affected by our Nation's economic downturn.

The people of my district also delivered me a message. This message speaks to the extent and the nature of the ongoing suffering throughout our Nation.

Like never before State and local governments are tightening their fiscal belts and reorganizing their administrative departments just to cope with the increased demands caused by the recession and dwindling Federal support for domestic programs.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received some very disturbing information from the Maryland Governor's office. According to the Governor, more citizens have joined Maryland's welfare rolls than ever before. This increase has astonishingly seen the largest increase within one of our State's wealthier counties.

Additionally, a whopping 10 percent of the people in Maryland are on Medicaid, with the numbers steadily increasing. I am sure that other States are experiencing the same, and America runs the risk of seriously jeopardizing our future potential by not giving the people of this Nation what they both want and need.

Over the past few years I have worked increasingly with the Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore and Baltimore county executive to provide increased funding for housing and community development. Most of these efforts have centered particularly around economic austerity measures and economic stabilization.

Mr. Chairman, it behooves me how the administration can submit a budget request with a \$500 million reduction in community development block grants, reductions in Medicaid and VA benefits without taking the plight of our Nation's States and local governments into account.

I support the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative because it discards the concept that America must keep a high defense budget to ward off unforeseen dangers in the world.

For me, the unforeseen danger arises when our children do not have proper preparation to compete in the job market. The threats occurs when we do not have a national energy plan to address our dependency on foreign energy supplies.

Additionally, the greatest threat is the lack of dignity and confidence in Government that an

unemployed worker feels when he or she is unable to work or even receive an extension in unemployment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I support the large defense savings in the alternative budget because our Nation must begin the task of economic conversion and retraining. My State has a large defense industry and many spinoff jobs related to this industry. The spillover in the economy from the layoffs of defense jobs presents a formidable challenge.

As Congress prepares to tackle this challenge, we must always remember that there have been darker days. But if there is one thing that I have learned in my years as an elected official is that you must always feed and assist your people.

Former House Speaker Thomas "Tip" O'Neil coined the phrase "All politics is local." Well, if we don't heed the words of this great sage, we may risk damaging the public's image of this institution.

The question facing Congress during these trying economic times is the same question that has always faced national leaders: What is the role of Government intervention and who should benefit? If you support helping the people you cannot overlook the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I want people of this Nation to feel secure and know that their leaders are debating their interests and concerns on the floor of this very House. America needs us today more than they have perhaps in the last 50 years.

I hear the pleas for help and pledge to do all I can to fix the economic machinery and do the right thing for America.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, I have listened patiently to the debate on this substitute amendment that would decimate our national defense posture even more than does the Democrat budget that will be before us next. We went through all this for 7 hours up in the Committee on Rules yesterday. I do not know all of the details of this substitute and how it would affect the 2 million young men and women who presently serve in our military, but I do know how the Democrat budget would affect them.

As my colleagues know, I met with Secretary Richard Cheney yesterday morning, and we talked about all of these amendments. We talked about the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and I have great respect for the gentleman, as he knows. But Secretary Cheney told me, "GERRY, you know, if the Democrat budget is enacted, it's going to be a disaster."

□ 1610

And he went on to enlighten me as to the reasons why. The one thing that struck me then and that struck me later as I sat in my office for the last 3 hours listening to this debate was the talk about jobs. We discussed the issue

of jobs yesterday in the Rules Committee, and I was so taken aback and I felt so offended because so many people where insinuating or inferring that military jobs are not real jobs, that a military career is not an honorable career. They seemed to be saying that because a military career is associated with the words "war" and "death," somehow it is not an honorable career. I really just became very upset.

But what Dick Cheney told me—and we all have great respect for him; there is not a partisan bone in his body—was that under his proposal to Congress and in the President's budget they are going to be cutting our defense budget by 25 percent over the next 5 years. That alone is going to require laying off or furloughing 25 percent of the 2 million military personnel we have today serving our country. Twenty-five percent of 2 million is 500,000 over a period of 5 years. That is what the President's budget does; and that is hard enough. But the Democrat budget before us would increase that figure to 500,000 in just 1 year.

I do not know how many Members have kids or family members in the military, but 500,000 people are going to be laid off in the next 12 months without jobs to fall back on. Just think about that.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I am sure the gentleman is not making the argument that the defense budget of this country ought to be a jobs program. I think it ought to be tailored, and I would think the gentleman would agree, with the threat that exists in the world today. So if the gentleman is critical of the extent of the cuts on the military spending side that he sees in this alternative, I would like to know what the nature of the threat is that he sees that justifies higher numbers.

I have seen the wall fall. I think America has seen Eastern Europe grow independent. The Soviet Union is no longer the Soviet Union. There is no longer a Warsaw Pact. There are unilateral cutbacks in offensive strategic nuclear weapons.

I have great respect for the gentleman, but to stand on the floor and simply talk about job losses is a little bit like, it seems to me, in post-revolutionary France talking about the number of people being laid off who used to make guillotines. They decided to do away with guillotines and the job loss was accepted in post-revolutionary France because there was a better way to employ people.

I think we are making the argument today that there is a better way to employ people than building MX missiles

or weapons systems that are beyond what we need to defend America, and I think that is the way we ought to structure our defense budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman would agree or I hope he would agree, but I do not hear him arguing that way.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the gentleman has so inspired me that I am going to give him an answer, and I hope he stays around and listens because I am going to speak to that very issue. I am going to talk about the need to provide an adequate defense for America and at the same time provide these jobs. I am so inspired by this debate that I am going to give the speech that I gave last night to the National Veterans of Foreign Wars. We had, I think, over 100 members from Oregon out of the 2,500 present last night, and they all got up and cheered after I finished saying what I am about to say again now.

So I am sure the gentleman will appreciate that, and I will send him a copy of this speech. I did receive last night the Congressional Award. It is one of the finest awards that I have ever received in my life, and I have received most of them from all the major veterans' organizations over the last 5, 6, and 7 years.

But let me just tell you what I told them. I just happen to have the speech here, and I really appreciate the gentleman's getting me excited enough to give it.

I told the Veterans of Foreign Wars that their greatest accomplishment in the 1980's was their never-ending support of the peace-through-strength philosophy for a strong national defense second to none. "And we are going to keep it that way, guys." The peace-through-strength concept stopped international communism dead in its tracks. It brought the Soviet Union to its knees, as the gentleman mentioned, and it is the very reason that democracy is breaking out all over this world today. It is the very reason that our military in magnificent fashion, led by Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, was so successful in Operation Desert Storm. And we can be so proud of those young men and women and the wherewithal we gave them to fight with because of the peace-through-strength policy.

I went on to tell them—and I will get to the point now that I am going to make—that the threat to American freedom is still present. Does anybody think it is not there? Yes, the Berlin Wall has fallen thanks to Ronald Reagan and peace-through-strength and this Congress which backed him up. The former Soviet Union is no more.

But, Mr. Chairman, the cold, hard fact is that tens of thousands of armed nuclear missiles are still pointed at America, nuclear warheads pointed at your city and mine, at my children and

your grandchildren. Four million Soviet troops are still in uniform, and they are still armed with all the conventional weapons. They remain in uniform, and the new Russian confederacy is still volatile. It is still hostile. It is still unstable. Nobody knows the future of it. Nobody knows what is going to happen to that so-called new Russian confederacy.

Mr. Chairman, there is something else out there. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is serving on the Intelligence Committee, and he has the same information that I have. We know there is the very serious threat that no less than 10, and maybe even more, anti-American terrorist countries have a nuclear missile capability or are on the verge of having a nuclear missile capability.

I ask the gentleman to go upstairs to the Intelligence Committee and see what they say about Libya and what is happening there. And I say to my friends that any one of those countries would not hesitate for a minute to launch a sneak terrorist attack on Americans both here in the United States and overseas, where our people do not have the ability to protect themselves.

And, of course, there is something else we need to be concerned about. I hear all this stuff about the cold war being over, and, yes, we have made great strides. But we know there is something still out there that is called deadly atheistic communism, which still enslaves nearly half the population of the world.

The last time I looked, Cuba was still enslaved, so was North Korea and Vietnam, and over a billion people in mainland China.

Mr. Chairman, as I told the VFW the other night, this is why we must never let down our guard. We must never again let America go undefended as we did in 1941, on December 7, and we are not going to.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I cannot yield until I have finished. I will be more than glad to yield later. We reserved some time over here so we could have a little give and take. I really enjoy this, and I do have great respect for the gentleman.

We must absolutely continue to maintain a peace-through-strength national defense that can guarantee the protection of America and our interests overseas.

Yes, while we are still protecting America, we can reduce our defense budget within reason, but only within reason, as Secretary Cheney and Gen. Colin Powell have recommended. And, yes, most of those savings should go to reducing the unconscionable deficit that is ruining the economy and causing unemployment around the country.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. No; I will be glad to yield when I am through, and that will not be very much longer now.

I might say this to the gentleman: If there are any defense savings that are not applied to reducing the deficit, they ought to go—and I will work toward this with every ounce of strength I have—directly toward restoring the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital and Health Care Programs to a funding level that will guarantee our Nation's obligations to provide the highest quality medical care to any—I repeat, any—sick and disabled veterans. And we will do it in veterans' hospitals, not under a so-called national health care program that wipes out all the veterans' hospitals. I say to my colleagues, "That ain't going to happen."

□ 1620

Mr. Chairman, we are getting to the point that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCCOIN] brought up, the issue about job programs in the military. I am going to tell you about that. Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell you about that.

We must fight to make sure that the future veterans of America, including the young men and women serving in our all-volunteer military today—all volunteer, every one of them brave and young volunteers—continue to be—and this goes back to Desert Storm—continue to be the brightest, the best educated, the best trained, the best equipped, and the most highly motivated young men and women that I have ever seen in the military. And I have been associated in one way or another with it for 40 years.

Mr. Chairman, we must make absolutely sure that these volunteers, coming from the inner cities of America, coming from the suburbs, coming from the farms, coming from all across America, have an opportunity—listen to these words—an opportunity to serve proudly and honorably in the military. And these are honorable jobs. These are not makeshift, unreal jobs. I get furious when I hear that.

Mr. Chairman, the military is where the young men and women serving today can accumulate up to \$25,000—listen to this now—\$25,000 of educational benefits through the Montgomery GI bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and I helped put that bill through, and hundreds of thousands of young men and women are taking advantage of it who never would have had the chance.

Mr. Chairman, this is my whole point that I want to make: we talk about job programs and the need to teach our kids something. If they enter our military today, these kids learn something desperately needed in America today: they learn how to be good citizens.

I know a lot of people do not associate the military with good citizenship.

Well, let me tell you about it. In today's military our young people learn things all too often neglected in our schools today, for whatever reason. Our teachers have to spend 75 percent of their time parenting because these poor kids do not have two parents at home. They are lucky if they have one, and many of them do not have any.

Mr. Chairman, do you know what they learn in the military? They learn, my friends, discipline, and they learn respect. They learn teamwork, and they learn responsibility.

Think about those words. They learn about the importance of being polite and courteous. Polite and courteous. They learn to live by the rule of law, quite often for the first time in their entire lives. These young kids of 18, 19, and 20, were never taught what the rule of law means, how to be law-abiding citizens.

Do you know something else so terribly important? They learn not—I repeat, not—to use illegal drugs. My God, is that not wonderful? We all know what has happened to drug use in the military, where it has been reduced from 25 percent of personnel in 1982, down to 4 percent today.

That is our military. That is the kind of kids we have today. They learn the meaning of words like pride and patriotism.

I know, someone will say, "You are waving the flag." Those words to me mean more than anything else in the world.

And let me tell you something else: they even—more often than not—learn a little religion. What do you think about that? In the military. In this awful, awful military that some people talk about, they learn about religion.

I have talked with our military personnel. I have talked to them in Brooklyn and South Bronx. I met with them over in Saudi Arabia. Many of them are from inner cities, from broken homes, from middle-class America, from all walks of life. They join the military, they become good citizens, and they learn these terribly, terribly important principles they somehow missed back home and they somehow did not get in school.

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to my very point. When their enlistment is over, when they have turned in their uniforms, when their service is done, they return to where? They return back home to Brooklyn or the South Bronx, or to Boston, MA, or to my hometown of Glens Falls, NY, or wherever they came from. And they take with them these ingrained principles that I have just outlined. I do not have to repeat them all. They take with them those ingrained principles. And they spread them throughout their community, throughout their town, and they teach it to their peers and to the younger generation.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for everybody in this body, on both

sides of this aisle. I really do. You are fine men and women. But I just get so exercised when I hear people knocking our military.

We are not going to allow this defense budget to be debated. We will maintain a strong national defense. We are going to do that. It will guarantee that jobs in our military are real. They are not fiction. They are just as real, Mr. Chairman, as our jobs. As a matter of fact, America could do without any one of us, but it cannot do without our military young men and women serving today.

Mr. Chairman, please excuse me for being so exercised, but I just had to let Members know how I feel. I hope Members will defeat this amendment and the Democrat budget and instead support Dick Cheney and Colin Powell, the people who really know what we need to maintain.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a sad state for any society that we paint a future for that society in which the young children acquire all the virtues and values that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just described only if they pick up arms.

Mr. SOLOMON. Oh, no.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Chairman, what this budget does that we are proposing is to invest in education and Head Start. We are talking about increasing Pell grants for the acquisition of skills in college so that our kids can acquire not only values, but the kind of training that will meet the new threat, the threat in the 21st century. That is a security threat just as real as any we knew in the cold war, that long twilight struggle that JFK described. And that threat is an economic threat, one that comes out of the Pacific rim, one that comes out of Europe. It is an economic threat in which our workers can be dislocated if we do not train our workers and make them the highly skilled workers they are going to have to be in order to compete and command the jobs that a thriving economy provides.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed, seriously, with the passion and commitment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to the brave young people who do volunteer. Obviously there are benefits. There are also risks. People that volunteer know at any time they may be put at risk and have their lives disrupted.

But I was impressed, seriously, with the description of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] of the beneficial effects of the military experience. I think that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things that those of us that may think it should be small ought to be very careful not to do in any way is to denigrate the military. All those things the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said are correct.

But as the gentleman described the importance of the military experience, the advantages it can mean for our young men and women, the ability to which it can help improve them, I do have to ask him, does the gentleman not agree then that it is a good thing that if any of the young people in this country are prepared to abide by the rules of the military—follow all the rules and deal with them—that they ought to be given that opportunity? Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] agree with that?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do not know if I really understood the question. But I think I agree with the concept of what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is saying.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the question is whether or not we ought to have a uniform rule that the enormous valuable experience that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has described, the ability to serve your country and benefit from it at the same time, ought to be available to anyone who would participate.

I would say to the gentleman that that is why many of us feel that an exclusion based upon people's sexuality is in fact an unfair denial of that opportunity. I would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and others to consider, as the gentleman talked quite eloquently, passionately, and correctly, in my judgment, about what an important aspect of the citizenship experience that is, whether or not it is unwise to deny that in a blanket way to a significant class of our fellow citizens, no matter how much they might be able to comply with the rules?

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] what he thought about that?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just think the military is an all-volunteer military, and certainly law-abiding American citizens should be allowed in our military. I support the existing standards that allow any qualified, able-bodied American to serve honorably in our Armed Forces.

At the same time, I do not mean to in any way try to insinuate that our military is made up of young kids who come from just the inner cities or just broken homes, because, as I said in my remarks, they come from a real cross-section of America.

□ 1630

But the point is that when they do go home, they return home as good citizens and they are able to teach this to the new generation. I just think it is so terribly important.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield one last time?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Again, I am sure the gentleman from New York was not going to try to insinuate anything, because I have known the gentleman for 11 years, and he is not an insinuator. He is occasionally a table-pounder, but he is always up front, and insinuation is not one of the gentleman's habits.

I appreciate what the gentleman said. I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that that is why many of us are deeply troubled by a policy that says to gay men and lesbians that no matter to what extent they are prepared to abide by the rules, like anybody else, they are absolutely from the outset unable to participate in that important experience, and that is why I would appeal to my friend to rethink that policy, because I think he more than anybody I have heard recently has pointed out how unfair that can be to young men and women who are prepared to be treated like everyone else and are denied the opportunity he has so eloquently described.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SOLOMON. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon, but I think I am out of time.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has the time, I would like the gentleman from New York to just respond to this question again. I listened very carefully after I asked the gentleman to describe the new national military security risk as we have come out of the cold war era and faced this brave new world. What I really heard him talk about were the values that come and the benefits that come to people who serve.

Mr. SOLOMON. That might not ordinarily be there.

Mr. AUCOIN. I do not dispute the fact that there are values and benefits that come when one serves, because I did serve. I volunteered and served for 3 years myself.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes; I know the gentleman did.

Mr. AUCOIN. But, Mr. Chairman, that is no argument for building a large standing army.

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely not.

Mr. AUCOIN. If we took that to its logical extreme, we would quadruple the Army and starve every other part of our forces. Our forces, notwithstanding those benefits to the individuals who served proudly, ought to be designed against a threat.

When I joined the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, I was told that our military budget was designed and the foundation of it was that we would be prepared to fight a global nuclear war, that we would be able to fight it on a prolonged basis, and that we would be able to prevail. I guess that means to win.

However ridiculous that might have been at the time it was proposed, I would submit that fighting, preparing, and investing our resources today in a military budget that is unchanged substantially from where it was in the cold war to in fact fight a global, protected nuclear war in which we think we could win makes absolutely no sense in the world.

The threat has changed. Because it has changed, with no denigration whatsoever to the proud people in uniform, I think we can make valid arguments that the investments in the military ought to be reduced and we ought to transfer those investments into human capital, the kind of human capital that is going to be the next test for America's security. It is the economic threat coming out of Europe, coming out of Japan, that will determine whether or not we remain a superpower in an economic sense. That is the nature of the security threat we need to face today.

If we continue to overinvest in the military, walking backward into the future, we will be a muscle-bound blind giant and we will be defeated on the economic battlefield. That is what frightens the death out of the American people, workers who are dislocated today and who worry about what their future is tomorrow. Do not tell them that the Army is their answer, because that is not their answer.

We need to train engineers, we need to train mathematicians, we need to train high-technology people, we need to train people working in steel and rebuilding these basic industries here. That is what this budget is beginning to do, and the President's budget, regrettably, the one the gentleman from New York supports, does not do. So I thank the gentleman for listening to my questions.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman from Oregon makes very cogent remarks and he knows I have deep respect for him. We are not talking that much differently, except for my point that it is always better to be overprepared than underprepared. Any time we have been underprepared it has always cost tens of thousands more lives; and Desert Storm is the perfect example for being well prepared.

With the peace-through-strength policy that we developed, when we gave the military the Stealth bomber, when we gave it the F-17 fighter bomber, when we gave it the Patriot missile, the Tomahawk missile, and the night vision that the enemy did not have, we

came out of the Persian Gulf with less than 500 deaths on the battlefield. God forbid there were any, but there were so few because we were well prepared.

We are not going to let ourselves be unprepared. We are going to keep a strong national defense. A 25-percent cut recommended by President Bush and by Secretary Cheney and Colin Powell is reasonable, while still being able to defend America's interest.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I tried to listen diligently to my colleagues. I respect the gentleman's point of view. I respect his passion. I would simply like to respond on two points.

No. 1, on this side of the aisle, certainly to those of us who are the proponents of this budget, "antimilitary" is a non sequitur. That is not how we arrived at our position.

The logic of our position is very straightforward. We are saying that the military budget is not a jobs bill, the military budget is a response to our legitimate national security needs.

Mr. SOLOMON. I agree.

Mr. DELLUMS. Our national security needs are based upon our objective assessment of what our threats are out there. We said, as the threat has now either vanished, on the one hand, Warsaw Pact, or diminished, on the other hand, the Soviet Union, that our national security needs have now changed as a result of the changing threat assessment, and that means a diminished threat, because for four and one-half decades the Soviet Union-Warsaw Pact has been the linchpin of a high level of military readiness for all that period of time, so the threat is now down, and the curve of the military budget will go down.

But we are also practical people. We understand if we are going to activate troops or we are going to cancel military weapons contracts that is going to mean people are unemployed. That is real.

Persons who will be dislocated as a result of the military budget going down, because it is a legitimate response to our national security needs, are a matter of concern. Our response to that in very legitimate terms is to deal with a robust effort in economic conversion, on the one hand economic conversion in the context of the military itself. We said in that regard we ought to have a new GI bill, make it aggressive and progressive like the GI bill the gentleman from New York and I went to school on.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is right.

Mr. DELLUMS. When we came back from the military. We ought to have a housing allowance.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman from California was a good marine, too.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman. I do not talk about that very often, but that is part of my life as well.

We also ought to have housing allowances. We ought to have job training. We ought to have opportunity for people.

On the other side of it, as we convert from a military budget that exceeded \$300 billion in a world that seems to be screaming out for peace, that one way to capture these folks is to create new opportunities on the nonmilitary side of the economy.

So when the gentleman says that these are real jobs in the military, we do not quarrel with that. We are simply saying if the military budget is going to go down because the threat level has gone down and our national security interests have changed, that if those persons are going to be replaced then let us replace them with other kinds of jobs on the nonmilitary side of the sector.

The final point, we are not talking about makeshift employment. My philosophical view is this. A society cannot generate jobs in vacuum. We generate employment as a byproduct of our commitment to address other social problems. When we expand education, we will generate employment. When we deal with housing in this country, we will generate employment. When we engage in mass transit system development, we will generate employment. When we rebuild American cities that are decaying on a daily basis, we generate employment. When we rebuild the economic infrastructure of this country, we generate employment.

Those are not makeshift jobs, those are jobs that will increase the quality of life in this country and enhance our competitiveness on an international basis, and that is indeed the cornerstone, the linchpin, the underpinnings of the budget we have offered and laid out here for the American people to look at for 8 consecutive hours.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to make that statement.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I will include for the RECORD as part of my statement the statement of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, on February 25, 1992.

I just wish that every Member of the House could take the time to read this report. It talks about military posture, it talks about the prospects for arms control treaties, it talks about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

It talks about the danger of technology leakage from the Soviet successor states going into these terrorist states that I was mentioning earlier. It goes on to talk about China, mainland

China, having been such an important exporter of ballistic missiles, nuclear reactors, and related technology. These are facts. I could go on and on with this report, but time is running out.

STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE BEFORE THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 25, 1992

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to discuss some of the foreign issues relating to our national security and other national interests.

I will look first at developments in Russia and the other Soviet successor states.

I'll then turn to the issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

After that I'll mention developments in regions where our country has vital interests.

Finally, I will talk about other issues and areas where our government, and consequently the Intelligence Community, is deeply engaged.

PART I—THE SOVIET SUCCESSOR STATES

Political and economic developments

The reforms in the successor states face rough sledding. Though Russian President Yeltsin still enjoys considerable popular support, opposition is mounting to the pace and scope of the economic reform program. Russian Vice President Rutskoy has called the program a prescription for disaster and urged the imposition of an emergency regime.

The freeing of prices earlier this year resulted in modest boosts in the availability of goods, but scarcities remain widespread and many items are now beyond the reach of those with diminishing incomes.

Only minor progress has been achieved so far toward privatization. Economic reformers in Russia, Ukraine, and the other republics confront resistance from local leaders—many of them holdovers from the old regime—who oppose economic and political reform.

Despite these troubling signs, the Russian leadership appears committed to staying the course. The Yeltsin government has raised wages, pensions, and some social welfare spending in an effort to blunt domestic criticism, but so far it has not compromised on his basic program.

Signs in the other former Soviet republics of a commitment to reforms are encouraging. As in Russia, however, those efforts must overcome the challenge of an increasingly vocal, and hostile, opposition to marketization and democratization.

Members of the Commonwealth differ strongly about its role. All believe the CIS should control the strategic nuclear weapons. Beyond that, there appears to be little agreement.

The Russian leadership has argued that the Commonwealth should have a broad role in coordinating economic, military, and foreign policy.

Other republics, particularly Ukraine, think the only CIS role should be to control the strategic nuclear forces.

Most of the republics, wary that Russia will dominate the CIS, are pursuing bilateral ties with other states. But we think the successor states will find they need the CIS—or some alternative multilateral mechanism—to coordinate mutual economic activity.

The potential for conflict is rising. Despite some longstanding ethnic animosities and the rapidity of political and economic change, there has been relatively little ethnic conflict during the past few months. The increasing level of violence in the

Transcaucasus, however, is just one indication of the many simmering ethnic tensions that pose a long-term threat to the stability of the former Soviet republics.

The continuing dispute between Russia and Ukraine over the disposition of the Black Sea Fleet and the nature of the Commonwealth is just one indicator that the road to establishing stable, cooperative interpublic relations will be difficult. Although republic leaders recognize the need to cooperate, they continue to have fundamental differences over the sharing of power and resources.

Furthermore, even if the leaders are willing to compromise, now that the coercive restraints on their conduct have been swept away, many citizens of the new states are venting long-suppressed ethnic animosities: they are not yet ready to embrace ethnic harmony, even if it is in their economic self-interest.

All the successor states want good relations with the United States. Consequently, they have assured us of their commitment to economic and political reform, continued adherence to international agreements—particularly arms control agreements, and observance of human rights. Several areas of concern, remain, however. The members of the Commonwealth have not yet resolved all matters regarding ratification and implementation of arms control agreements. I will say more about this in a moment. They also continue to disagree over how to divide up the debt of the former U.S.S.R.

Military developments

The strategic forces are still formidable, but we foresee a reduction in strategic forces to well below START levels and major alterations in military doctrine, force goals, weapons requirements, and operations.

President Yeltsin has proposed an arms control agenda that include a reduction to 2,000-2,500 strategic warheads, less than half the level permitted by START.

Conscription shortfalls are beginning to affect even the strategic forces. Some units of the elite Strategic Rocket Forces are, by their own admission, at least 50 percent under strength. The submarine force is experiencing training deficiencies and an outflow of junior officers.

Operational deployments of many elements of the strategic forces appear to have declined.

On the other hand, some strategic force development and production programs are continuing.

SS-18 ICBMs continue to be produced in Ukraine and deployed in Russian and Kazakhstan. Production may cease after the current run; Ukrainian officials claim there are no new production orders.

As of earlier this month, road-mobile SS-25 ICBMs continued to be produced in Russia. Some were deployed in Russia and Byelorussia as late as last December.

In addition, several new strategic ballistic missiles are still in development.

The general purpose forces are fragmenting. They are at their lowest readiness level in decades.

These forces are being subjected to enormous material, psychological, and political pressures as the new republics reform their economic and political systems and sort out their interrelationships. Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova reject the idea of the CIS controlling the majority of the general purpose forces; they intend to form independent national forces from former Soviet units and equipment based on their territories. At the recent meeting of the CIS

heads of state in Minsk, Byelorussia reiterated its intention to have its own army but agreed to participate in a joint CIS force for a transitional period.

Complicating the relationship is the distribution of the former Soviet military units, equipment, and infrastructure in Russia, Ukraine, and Byelorussia. As a result of Soviet military deployments during the Cold War, Ukraine and Byelorussia now have what Russian leaders regard as disproportionately large shares of these assets. They believe that Russia's larger size and greater global status justify giving it more of these assets than the leaders of the other republics want to give up.

The former Soviet Union's nuclear weapons are being consolidated into Russia. Many of the tactical nuclear weapons have already been transferred there; by the late 1990s, all of the remaining strategic nuclear weapons will probably be in Russia as well. Currently, several thousand nuclear weapons are still located at well-secured installations in other republics.

But we face a period of uncertainty as Russia and the other nuclear republics sort out possession of the weapons and establish new structures and procedures for controlling and operating them. For now, Yeltsin and the General Staff retain control over all nuclear weapons through an elaborate and effective system of safeguards operated in the name of the CIS by the Ministry of Defense and the General Staff. But the military is being subjected to unprecedented stresses that the control system was not designed to absorb. The responsible personnel have many of the same economic problems and nationalist aspirations as their civilian countrymen.

Dismantling nuclear weapons will be difficult and costly and will take many years. There are several facilities capable of this task, all located in Russia. We are working with the Russians on ways to expedite the elimination of thousands of nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, even a diminishing strategic arsenal will still be capable of devastating the United States or other countries. Therefore, as long as there is any possibility that turmoil in the region could stimulate the emergence of a new, hostile regime, the remaining strategic weapons will constitute a danger to us.

Defense spending is plummeting. For the first quarter of this year, Russia's defense budget amounts to about 50 billion rubles. Annualized and adjusted for inflation, it would be about a third as large as last year's official defense budget for the entire Soviet Union. If the other CIS members contributed proportional shares, which we think unlikely, the total would be about half of Soviet defense spending last year. At Yeltsin's behest, parliament has cut military procurement spending in the first quarter by about 85 percent.

Although work continues at defense plants and R&D organizations, many defense enterprises have experienced funding shortfalls since last autumn, when republics stopped contributing to the union budget. They have also had to cope with loss of priority status, supply disruptions, and rising prices for raw materials and components. Enterprises have been trying to compensate by introducing or increasing output of nonmilitary goods, but most are having little success, leading them to look to arms exports as a source of needed revenue.

Prospects for the Arms Control Treaties

Prospects for implementation of the START Treaty appear reasonably good, given Russian leadership and control of strategic nuclear forces.

The Governments of Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Kazakhstan have declared their intent to abide by the START Treaty. Officials of the new states support the Treaty, because it provides a mechanism to ensure that reductions in strategic weaponry are accomplished in a prescribed manner and timeframe.

We anticipate some failures to meet Treaty deadlines and confusion over local restrictions, required notifications, and inspection procedures. But these difficulties will be an outgrowth of the unsettled conditions in the new countries rather than calculated efforts to evade provisions of the Treaty.

The detailed inspection procedures were designed to inhibit cheating, but that will be less of a concern than anticipated, at least for the next several years. The successor states lack both the motive and the economic wherewithal to engage in militarily significant cheating; moreover, because of their greater openness compared with the former Soviet Union, cheating would be much harder to conceal.

Ratification and implementation of the CFE Treaty face greater hurdles. Even though the successor states have declared their intention to abide by the Treaty's terms, they disagree on how to divide up the equipment allocated to the former Soviet Union under the CFE Treaty. They are under pressure to resolve the outstanding issues by July, when the CSCE summit is scheduled.

Implementing the CFE verification measures, such as information exchanges and on-site inspections, will be complicated by the need to deal with eight states rather than one. As with the START Treaty, however, the likelihood that militarily significant cheating could occur without being detected has become insignificant.

PART II—PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Today, more than 20 countries may have or may be developing nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons and the means to deliver them. Several have goals inimical to US interests.

As you know, we try in many ways to prevent the spread of technologies associated with weapons of mass destruction. But this is difficult, because many of them are so-called "dual use technologies"—that is, they have legitimate civilian applications. Unduly restricting trade in these technologies would mean limiting the ability of developing nations to modernize. For example, chemicals used to make nerve agents are also used to make plastics and pesticides. A modern pharmaceutical industry could produce biological warfare agents as easily as vaccines and antibiotics. Much of the technology needed for a ballistic missile program is the same as that needed for a space launch program.

The threat from weapons of mass destruction is increasing. Currently, only China and the CIS have surface-to-surface missiles that can reach US territory directly. We do not expect any other countries to develop the capability to threaten US territory with air- or missile-delivered special weapons for at least another decade. But there is a growing threat to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

US or multinational forces deployed abroad could face an increased threat of air-delivered nuclear weapons before the end of the decade. In addition, several countries already have missiles and rockets that could carry nuclear warheads; in coming years other countries will acquire such missiles, and some may try to arm them with nuclear warheads.

Most of the major countries in the Middle East have chemical weapon development programs, and some already have stockpiles that could be used against civilians or poorly defended military targets. Most countries have not yet equipped their delivery systems to carry weapons of mass destruction, but over the next decade, many countries—from North Africa through South Asia—will do so if international efforts to curtail this fail.

North Korea and possibly other countries may export extended-range missiles and the technology to produce them. Countries with special weapons that succeed in buying these missiles will accelerate the special weapons arms race already under way in the Middle East and South Asia.

The danger of technology leakage from Soviet successor states

Our government is leading an international effort to prevent, or at least minimize, the leakage of special weapons, materials, and knowhow from the Soviet successor states. President Yeltsin and most of the other republic leaders have announced policies to prevent a hemorrhaging of technology, especially in the nuclear realm. Notwithstanding numerous reports and rumors, we are not aware of any significant transfer of such technology so far. But life has become so difficult in the successor republics, for both industries and individuals formerly associated with Soviet special-weapons programs, that we fear some may listen to the siren songs of Third World states that want such weapons.

The potential brain drain is probably the greatest danger. We estimate that nearly a million Soviets were involved in nuclear weapons programs in one way or another, but probably only a thousand or two have the knowhow to design nuclear weapons. Probably a few thousand have knowledge or skills applicable to the development and production of biological weapons. We worry most about individuals whose skills have no civilian-job counterpart, such as nuclear weapons designers and BW experts, for whom assistance mechanisms have not yet been put in place. They were well treated under the Soviet system, and will find it hard to get comparable positions now. Most Soviet scientists who want to emigrate probably would prefer to settle in the West, but the West probably cannot absorb all of them.

But some technology transfers will be legitimate. We expect the former Soviet Union's defense industrial sector to market dual-use technologies, notably for nuclear power and space launch vehicles. For example, Russian and Ukrainian producers of space-launch vehicles are marketing launch services. ICBM producers are offering the SS-25 and other ICBMs as space launchers. Other nations with ambitious weapons development programs are certain to try to exploit the opportunity to get some of the world's most advanced weapons technology and materials at bargain prices.

I should add that other highly sophisticated, but less controlled, "conventional" military technologies and weapons may also be made available for export by various successor states. Technologies particularly in demand include stealth, counterstealth, thermal-imaging, and electronic warfare. Weapons in demand include fuel-air explosives, precision guided munitions, and advanced torpedoes.

Overview of major proliferators

Iraq is still a major proliferation threat. Saddam built formidable programs in all four special weapons areas. Desert Storm

significantly damaged Iraq's special weapons production programs, and the UN Special Commission has worked diligently to eliminate what remained of them. But we believe Baghdad has been able to preserve significant elements of each of the special weapons programs, and, of course, Iraq's scientists and engineers retain their knowhow. So, once again Iraq is free to begin rebuilding its special weapons capabilities, it will not have to start from scratch.

The nuclear weapon development program would need the longest time to recover, perhaps a few years, because even though Iraq retains its nuclear knowhow and some equipment, much of the infrastructure for the production of fissile material would have to be rebuilt.

Much of the chemical weapons production infrastructure would also have to be rebuilt, but we believe Saddam may have preserved enough production capability to resume producing chemical agents almost immediately.

The biological weapons program also was damaged, but some critical equipment escaped damage during the war. Because only a small amount of equipment is needed, in the absence of sanctions the Iraqis could be producing BW materials in a matter of weeks after a decision to do so.

We believe the Iraqis have been able to preserve some Scud-missiles, along with much Scud and Condor production equipment. Before they could resume production, however, they might need to get additional equipment from abroad.

Iran is building up its special weapons capabilities as part of a massive, across-the-board effort to develop its military and defense industries.

Iran continues to shop Western markets for nuclear and missile technology and is trying to lure back some of the technical experts the Khomeini regime drove abroad during the 1980s. Increasingly, however, Iran has turned to Asian sources of military and technical aid, and it probably hopes contacts in Kazakhstan will allow it to tap into Soviet weapons technology. Tehran's principal sources of special weapons since the Iran-Iraq war have been North Korea for regular and extended-range Scuds and China for battlefield missiles, cruise missiles, ballistic missile technology and components, and nuclear technology.

Syria, too, has turned to North Korea. Because Damascus has been unable to get SS-23s from the Soviet Union, it acquired an extended range Scud missile from P'yongyang. It also appears to be seeking assistance from foreign firms to improve its CW or BW warhead technology.

Libya is also trying to expand its special weapons capabilities, but with only mixed success. We estimate that the production facility at Rabta produced and stockpiled as much as 100 tons of chemical agents before the Libyans cleaned it up, perhaps in preparation for the long-awaited public opening of the facility to demonstrate its alleged function of producing legitimate pharmaceuticals. But the plant is still capable of producing chemical agents. In any case, we believe the Libyans are constructing another chemical weapon production facility—one they hope will escape international attention.

In addition, for several years the Libyans have been trying to build a BW facility but without much success. We believe they would need foreign help to establish a significant BW program.

Thanks in part to US efforts, the Libyans are having difficulty finding foreign help.

Persistent international efforts to deny Libya access to nuclear, BW, and delivery system technology have forced Qadhafi to turn to the less advanced technology and less trustworthy sources available on gray and black markets in the developing world. As a result, Libya is still unable to project its power very far. Both Russia and China have rejected Libya's efforts to purchase missiles with longer range than the Scuds it already possesses. Tripoli is now shopping diligently for an alternative source: South Korea has alleged that North Korea may be the answer.

Algeria is nearly finished building a nuclear reactor it bought from China. Both the Algerians and Chinese have assured us the reactor will be used only for peaceful purposes, but the secrecy that attended the arrangement leaves us with some lingering suspicions. The International Atomic Energy Agency and the Algerian Government have recently completed an agreement to safeguard the reactor. The IAEA Board of Governors will review the agreement at its next meeting, after which more information on the safeguards will be available.

India and Pakistan continue their race to develop weapons of mass destruction. Not only do both countries have nuclear weapon and ballistic missile programs, they have recently pursued chemical weapons as well. We have no reason to believe that either country maintains assembled nuclear bombs, much less that either has deployed them. But such weapons could be assembled quickly, and both countries have combat aircraft that could be modified to deliver them in a crisis. One hopeful sign is that both have publicly agreed to certain confidence-building measures, such as not attacking each others' nuclear facilities.

Our government continues to oppose exports of space launch vehicle or advanced computer technology to either country because of the high probability that such technology would end up in a long-range ballistic missile program.

North Korea constitutes one of the world's major proliferation threats. P'yongyang depends on arms sales for much of its hard currency earnings. It has produced and sold copies of the Soviet Scud missile to several Middle Eastern countries. It has sold modified, longer-range Scuds to Iran and Syria. P'yongyang is developing a much larger missile, one with a range of at least 1,000 kilometers.

In addition, P'yongyang has been building an infrastructure that can, without input from abroad, produce weapons grade fissile material from scratch. It has domestic uranium mines. At Yongbyon it has constructed two nuclear reactors whose sole purpose appears to be to make plutonium. One of these reactors has been operating for four years; the second, much larger reactor, may start up this year. Nearly completed is another facility at Yongbyon that can reprocess reactor fuel to recover the plutonium. Even after North Korea accumulates enough plutonium, making a device would require several additional steps that could take months or even years.

Last December, North and South Korea negotiated an agreement-in-principle for a nuclear-free peninsula. Each side has committed itself not to "test, manufacture, produce, receive, possess, store, deploy, or use" nuclear weapons. Both sides also agreed not to have nuclear reprocessing or uranium enrichment facilities. There are grounds for questioning the North's sincerity, given that it has not yet even admitted the existence

of, much less declared, the plutonium production reactors and reprocessing facility at the Yongbyon nuclear research center.

Moreover, verification procedures remain to be worked out. The validity of the North-South nuclear accord depends on the inspection regime P'yongyang ultimately accepts. Historically, North Korea has not been forthcoming in this area. It signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in December 1985, and was thereby obligated to declare and place all nuclear facilities under safeguards. Only last month, however, did P'yongyang get around to signing a safeguards agreement. So we wonder when the North Koreans will accept meaningful on-site inspections that could allay our suspicions.

Some aspects of P'yongyang's behavior so far could be interpreted as an effort to continue nuclear weapon development despite its public statements favoring a nuclear-free peninsula. Several milestones coming up in the next few months, including declaration of nuclear facilities and agreement on inspection protocols, should reveal whether the North is sincere or not.

Where North Korea is concerned, moreover, we have to worry not only about the consequences for stability in Northeast Asia if it acquires nuclear weapons, but also about the possibility that P'yongyang might put nuclear materials and related technologies on the international market. In the past, they have been willing to sell anything that could earn hard currency.

China has been an important exporter of ballistic missiles, nuclear reactors, and related technology. Beijing is developing two solid-fuel SRBMs, the M-9 and M-11, which exceed the range and payload limits of the Missile Technology Control Regime (300 kilometers and 500 kilograms). In the past, Beijing offered to sell these missiles, claiming that their range and payload parameters did not exceed the MTCR guidelines. More recently, the Chinese have indicated that they would honor the MTCR parameters and guidelines if certain US Government sanctions are lifted.

Last fall, China announced its intention to ratify the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Once it has done so, it will be obligated to require all recipients of its nuclear equipment to adhere to IAEA safeguards. China has long been a supplier of nuclear technologies in the Third World but has not always required recipients to adhere to safeguards.

These commitments by China attest to the importance it attaches to relations with the United States. Because China values the US market and desires continued Western investment and access to Western technology, and because Beijing and Washington have compatible foreign policy objectives in a number of regions, including Cambodia and Korea, China wants a solid working relationship with the United States.

There is certain to be continuing debate in Beijing over the pros and cons of accommodating US and international interests on sales of military and nuclear equipment and technology. But by adhering to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and MTCR guidelines, Beijing would become a formal supporter of both regimes. It would be a major step forward for international cooperation against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

PART III—COUNTRIES AND REGIONS WHERE U.S. INTERESTS ARE ENGAGED

Prospects for Saddam Husayn

A year after Desert Storm Saddam Husayn's control of Iraq's territory and peo-

ple is eroding, mainly because he has not been able to extract his country from the grip of U.N. sanctions. Saddam has demonstrated an impressive capability to adapt and survive, but he now faces mounting unease within his inner circle and the Sunni Arab community, long his prime base of support.

Saddam's support is eroding among key segments of Iraq's population, including important tribal and family groups within the military and security services. They have become disaffected by the deteriorating economic conditions, the uneven distribution of food and medical supplies, and the lack of progress toward restoring a reasonable standard of living for most Iraqis.

The Kurdish uprising in the north and the Shia uprising in the south are also troublesome for Saddam, because they deflect resources that he could otherwise use to shore up support in his core constituencies. We do not believe, however, that either the Kurdish or Shia insurgencies threaten his regime directly.

Despite signs that discontent with Saddam's leadership is greater than ever before, fear and intimidation continue to prevent his opponents from acting individually, while disunity and the pervasive security system impede the formation of a collective opposition. Consequently, we cannot say whether—much less when—public frustration or political and military defections will lead to his overthrow.

Prospects for the Arab-Israeli peace talks

The talks are reducing the threat of open conflict between Arabs and Israelis. The willingness of most parties to come to the negotiating table to discuss economic and environmental issues, as well as territorial disputes and formulas for troop withdrawals, adoption of confidence building measures, international recognition and normalization of relations makes another Arab-Israeli war in the near term less likely.

The recent Israeli assassination of Hizballah leader Abbas Musawi and attacks on Palestinian camps and Hizballah strongholds in Lebanon are not likely to derail the peace process, at least not right away. The major participants in the talks, despite continuing concerns about both procedural and substantive issues, remain committed to the process and appear unwilling to pay the price for being the first to bring about its demise.

To avenge Musawi's death, we expect Hizballah to step up terrorist attacks against Israeli targets, and the more radical Palestinian factions also may join in. The Israelis can be expected to retaliate forcefully, perpetuating the cycle of alternating violence. In such an atmosphere, public positions harden and it becomes increasingly difficult, especially for Arab governments and the Palestinians, to justify their continued participation in the peace process. In addition, members of official Arab delegations increasingly will fear for their personal safety.

What lies ahead for Cuba?

Cuba's glacial progress toward Utopia appears to have ground to a halt again. Fidel Castro is facing unprecedented challenges to his regime's survival. With the end of substantial economic subsidies provided for decades by the Soviet Union, the Cuban economy is plunging. Factories are closing, and growing numbers of people are being moved to agricultural work camps. The regime is now using beasts of burden to replace agricultural equipment and bicycles to supplement the crippled mass transit system.

Meanwhile, as opposition from human rights activities and other emerging pockets of dissent increases, the regime has been responding with more brutal repression.

Threats to democracy in Latin America

The rest of Latin America has enjoyed a dramatic transformation to elected civilian government, and there is a growing move away from statist to free market economic systems. These trends still face serious challenges in some countries, however.

In Peru, the Fujimori administration confronts a combination of highly threatening and intractable problems. It has the daunting mission of attempting to implement comprehensive and effective programs to address serious economic, insurgency, human rights, and narcotics problems simultaneously. The threat to stability is exacerbated by the growing involvement of two powerful leftist and anti-U.S. terrorist and insurgent groups in narcotics activities. The Sendero Luminoso, in particular, is a savage guerrilla organization that has gained sway over large areas of the Peruvian countryside and is increasingly active in Lima.

In Venezuela, President Perez remains firmly committed to economic reform despite social unrest and the attempted military coup early this month. Most of the military remained loyal to the President and the democratic system, and the people of Venezuela did not support the rebels. Nevertheless, the incident demonstrates that even stable democracies in the region remain vulnerable to the pressures generated by economic modernization.

PART IV—OTHER AREAS OF NATIONAL SECURITY IMPORT

Aside from what we might call the traditional issues of national security, other issues that could threaten our national interests are demanding our attention. An attribute they have in common is that they cannot be resolved simply through the application of military force or diplomacy. Following are some examples:

International crime, including terrorism, narcotics trafficking, theft of technology, and the potential for massive sabotage of computer and information systems.

International economic problems, including energy security, unfair trade practices, the difficulties facing the GATT, collapsing economies, and massive public debt.

Problems affecting the viability of societies, such as overpopulation, hunger, and the spread of AIDS and other devastating diseases.

Environmental problems, associated with pollution and degradation of the air, land, and sea, including disposal of nuclear waste and other toxic materials, deforestation, desertification, destruction of fisheries, global warming, and ozone depletion.

The last part of my presentation will be a kind of whirlwind tour of some of these issue areas. I do this to demonstrate the really broad range of U.S. interests and involvement abroad and to emphasize the growing importance to our national security of non-military issues.

U.S. citizens and property will remain frequent targets of foreign terrorists during the coming two years.

State sponsored terrorism has declined considerably in the past year or two, owing mostly to concerted international pressure on sponsors such as Libya and Iraq, but it remains a serious threat, because international terrorist groups supported by such states retain their capabilities. Among the state sponsors, Iran has become the most ac-

tive, sponsoring attacks mostly against its own dissidents abroad as well as against Israeli interests.

Meanwhile, for mostly local reasons, anti-U.S. terrorism by domestic leftwing groups has increased in recent years in a number of countries, particularly in Greece, Turkey, Peru, and the Philippines.

International events and developments sometimes stimulate terrorism. In the coming months, for example, positive developments in the Arab-Israeli peace process would be likely to trigger terrorist attacks by Palestinian or other opponents of such progress. Basque separatist terrorism is a potentially serious threat at the Olympic Games in Barcelona this summer.

The news on the counternarcotics front is mixed. Significant progress in countering the cocaine trade has been made in the past two years, though cocaine remains our country's principal illicit narcotics problem. Meanwhile, however, we are losing ground to the heroin traffickers.

Cocaine seizures in Latin America more than doubled between 1989 and 1991. The growth in coca cultivation has leveled off, and traffickers are under growing government pressure. These successes reflect increased efforts by Latin American leaders to address the domestic threats posed by the spread of drugs and related violence. It also reflects increased cooperation between the United States and the key producing and transit countries in the hemisphere.

Nevertheless, the cocaine traffickers will continue to diversify their transshipment methods and routes, and Latin American leaders will be challenged to improve the effectiveness of their judicial systems in dealing with the drug trade. U.S. leadership and assistance, along with a sustained, long-term commitment by the international community will be necessary to continue to make progress.

Heroin supplies to the United States will increase substantially over the next few years. Southeast Asia has emerged as the main source, producing more than half of the heroin consumed in the United States. Southwest Asia and Mexico also supply substantial amounts. Colombian cocaine producers are beginning to produce heroin since it is more lucrative than cocaine. Nevertheless, many governments besides the United States face mounting public pressure to take action against heroin. As a result, the prospects for international cooperation on controlling heroin production and transshipment are improving.

Economic issues have become primary determinants of our national well-being. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, is a good example of such an issue. With foreign trade now amounting to almost a quarter of our GDP, our economic interests require a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations. Indeed, most of the world would benefit from such a result.

Disagreements over the European Community's agricultural support system have been a stumbling block at the Uruguay Round. The United States, along with other agricultural exporters, such as Australia, Canada, and Brazil, want the EC members to sharply cut their export subsidies and reform agricultural policies that encourage overproduction. Most EC members recognize that the inefficient and costly system must be reformed but want to proceed at a gradual pace.

U.S. interests are closely tied to mounting international environmental problems. Is-

suues such as possible global warming, ozone depletion, shrinking forests, growing deserts, and the need to do a better job of disposing of hazardous waste are forcing governments worldwide to negotiate new international accords. The problems are complicated by conflicting interests and incomplete and even contradictory scientific data. Nevertheless, it is already clear that traditional national security aims need now to be augmented by a new level of bilateral and regional cooperation to deal with issues of air, water, and soil pollution that cross international frontiers.

Population growth and migration will cause great social stresses in the coming decades. The political and economic systems of many developing countries are already overburdened by runaway population growth. Except for Asia and Latin America, where family planning programs are making some headway, most less-developed countries face even more rapid population growth in the years ahead as today's infants reach maturity. One major source of instability will be the growing numbers of young people whose expectations will be higher than ever before as a result of improvements in health care and education, but who will be frustrated as they compete for fewer opportunities.

Ironically, many industrialized countries have the opposite problem: population growth rates that are so low in some countries the population could actually decline. Fewer and fewer workers will have to provide for more and more older citizens. One solution, of course, is immigration from overpopulated parts of the world. But many of the countries that need workers have relatively homogeneous populations which are not ready to incorporate large numbers of foreigners into their societies as full citizens. Thus, some countries facing a labor shortage may be neither willing nor able to absorb as many foreign workers as would be needed to resolve it.

But depending on large numbers of immigrant workers who are denied full rights of citizenship is inherently destabilizing. Members of the European Community received more immigrants between 1988 and 1990 than during the entire previous decade. Not coincidentally, hostility towards immigrants has increased markedly in some of these countries.

Africa is on the frontline in the race between progress and population growth. With the world's highest rates of population growth, Africans are finding it increasingly difficult to generate enough jobs or produce enough food and goods to maintain life at even a subsistence level. Population growth also contributes to environmental degradation. Continual pressure to bring new land under cultivation combined with outmoded agricultural practices and inadequate conservation, has led to steady destruction of Africa's forests. How much this contributes to global warming is not clear, but it reduces biodiversity—the variety of genetic material available for pharmaceutical and agricultural research.

As you know, our country is spending about a billion dollars in aid to Africa this year, even though no country there threatens our national security.

Our interests are humanitarian: we don't want people to starve, or die in droves from diseases such as AIDS.

Our interests are protective: twice in the past two years our country has had to send troops to an African country to evacuate U.S. and other foreign citizens who were in danger from the collapse of public order.

Our interests are practical: if we are going to provide aid, it makes sense to try to send

help before fragile democracies crumble, before weak economies collapse, before divided societies disintegrate.

Sub-Saharan Africa remains politically volatile despite the end of warfare in Angola and Ethiopia last year.

In Sudan, the government's rigidly Islamist policies are prolonging the civil war.

Anarchy in Somalia has produced one of the world's worst humanitarian crises.

Chad is an ethnic tinderbox, perennially vulnerable to Qadhafi, the regional arsonist.

After destroying a functional society, the fighting in Liberia has spilled over into Sierra Leone and threatens to disrupt the stability of other neighboring states.

Mozambique is moving toward a political settlement, but the civil war continues to take a huge toll on civilians and to disrupt neighboring countries.

Yet democratization has brought peaceful transitions of power through elections in Zambia, Benin, Sao Tome, and Cape Verde. Though there are risks:

Popular expectations may outpace the ability of fragile governments to deliver.

Voters will resent painful but necessary economic austerity programs.

As demonstrated in the Horn of Africa, longstanding rivalries could surface, leading to seemingly endless conflict or secessionism.

Africans under economic duress may surrender tender democracies to Islamic extremists.

South Africa's effort to craft a truly democratic and equitable multiracial society resonates strongly in our own country. Key South African leaders appear committed to working out a more equitable system. Discussions of transitional arrangements and a new constitution are vital steps forward. But endemic violence threatens to halt progress. The violence may be exacerbated by the whites-only referendum scheduled for next month, in which de Klerk will seek a mandate to continue the reconciliation process.

The scourge of AIDS is now worst in Sub-Saharan Africa, but it is spreading at an alarming rate throughout the world. We estimate a cumulative total of over 10 million cases by the end of the decade. During the 1990s, AIDS in the Caribbean countries will proceed to a scale comparable to that of Africa, with similar dire results. In India, Thailand and Brazil, AIDS is a major threat on the horizon and will contribute significantly to an estimated 45 million infections worldwide by the year 2000. The impact of AIDS in the 1990s will be far greater than in the 1980s, weakening elites and inflicting significant social and economic damage.

I could continue to describe other important areas the Intelligence Community is following. For example, I have hardly mentioned the countries of Europe or the Pacific rim, on whose cooperation and good will our country's prosperity so heavily depends. I haven't mentioned the international technology race, or energy security, or the growing financial interdependence of modern societies. It's tough to give a global briefing nowadays.

Instead, however, I would like to close with this observation. All historical experience suggests to us that, while the revolutionary upheavals we have seen and experienced have succeeded in breaking us loose from the past, the final shape of the future is far from established. We should expect continuing change and upheaval around the world—aftershocks, if you will—before the form and patterns of a new era settle into place.

Our national security institutions, especially defense and intelligence, must change—and they are changing dramatically—to meet the new and different challenges of this new and different world. But our changes must also conform to the reality of an unstable, unpredictable, dangerously over-armed, and still-transforming world, not yet the world of our hopes and dreams. We must avoid the costly mistake of 1919, 1945, 1953, and 1975 in thinking that we can disengage from the world and of too quickly disarming ourselves—of letting our hopes and our weary impatience overshadow our judgment, good sense, and historical realism.

Now I would be happy to answer any questions that I can address in open session.

□ 1640

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Coalition for their tireless efforts in completing such a thorough budget. You should be commended for seizing the opportunity to use the changes in the world order to create change in the social order of America using the budget process. The stated purpose of this alternative budget is to respond to the complete failure of the Bush administration budget approach to take advantage of the window of opportunity opened by making meaningful cuts in military spending.

George Bush and his cohorts would have you believe that the Democratic Congress is responsible for all the economic lamentations of the Nation. Or, he would tell you that the responsibility lies in a fork-tailed devil monster who has been looming in our backyards for years. This year, the monster incited by the Reagan/Bush administrations, moved into your homes and took them! It has invaded the American workplace, taking our jobs and gobbling up the manufacturing sector and the banking industry.

If you adopt the President's version of the budget, we would again fall prey to the supply side trickle down rhetoric that has, in fact, laid off our workers and closed our plants.

Today, we have the opportunity to adopt a budget proposal, as drafted by the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, that will bring parity and equity to our system by taking advantage of the huge cuts in defense spending.

The Black Caucus budget has been drafted to benefit all working-class Americans—those who have stood in line for welfare payments and those who have called our offices to voice concern about the plight of the Nation and the economy. It has provided a revenue neutral tax package that directs its benefits to the working and middle-class taxpayer by a progressive tax plan in keeping with the history of this

Nation. It would increase the marginal tax rate to 33 percent and create a 38 percent marginal tax rate for individuals earning more than \$150,000 a year. I realize that the people on the other side of the aisle consider that to be a moderate income rate, but to many of the constituents of my district, \$150,000 a year is more than adequate to live well.

Instead of raising revenue from the worn pocketbooks for this Nation's grandmothers' Social Security checks, the CBC budget would raise the wage cap on Social Security wages to the current level of the wage cap for the Medicare tax. In fact, the revenues gained from this proposal by a 0.2 percent reduction in the wage tax rate in the first year and a 0.4 percent decrease in the wage tax in future years.

The media has reported the upper-income taxpayers' dissatisfaction with increased tax rates and their threats that a larger tax burden will stop growth and thwart our Nation's ability to grow.

Mr. Chairman, this budget must be adopted if taxing the rich will bring equity to the system by requiring that they repay some of the wealth they have accumulated from the lenient tax policies of the past 8 years. The poor and middle class will finally be atoned. Congress who has received the message of the American people and recognizes that it must act now to ensure that their welfare and well-being is important. This measure does just that by converting the dependent child tax deduction to a tax credit.

The Preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America states that the Federal Government will provide for the economy, defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of posterity. President Bush has kept one part of the bargain by providing our Nation with defense, but what has happened to the general welfare? What has happened to our poor, our weak, our needy?

To the cheering crews at the 1988 Republican Convention, George Bush declared his mission to create 38 million jobs in 8 years. Instead, the Nation is facing a 7.1 percent unemployment rate.

It is estimated that the Bush economic package would create 500,000 new jobs in 1992. Sadly, the Bush plan is a drop in the bucket. For the last 2 months, the Bureau of Labor statistics has estimated that over 400,000 have filed for unemployment each week.

The United States has some of the world's most highly advanced health care resources; the world's best equipped hospitals and some of the best trained health professionals. At its finest, the American health care system can deliver unmatched quality—but only for those who can afford it. For those who cannot, the health care system has become a system careening

out of control. Health care costs have skyrocketed dramatically, and more and more Americans find themselves denied that quality and affordable care they need.

What we need is reform of our current health care system that creates a comprehensive, universally available single payer system. Such reform is long overdue. The current health care system fails to address people of color. African-Americans, Hispanics, native Americans, and Asian-Americans are much more likely to suffer higher mortality and infant/mortality rates; our workers are more likely to be uninsured for health care; and we are more likely to be poor.

I commend President Bush for allocating \$684 million, a \$90 million increase from his 1992 budget funding to expand health clinics and migrant health clinics; and his \$109.5 billion allocated in budget authority and \$108.2 billion in outlays for health programs, which is approximately \$14 billion above the 1992 level.

However, the most glaring drawback to the President's health care plan is that it does virtually nothing to control health cost—the single greatest problem in our health care system.

The number of deaths from preventable illnesses is at an all-time high. The lack of progress in providing minorities affordable health care is one of our Nation's most pressing problems and one of the greatest challenges facing us as policymakers.

Inadequate health care access and inferior treatment combine to discourage many minorities from seeking any type of health care until it is too late. But the root of the problem lies in the lack of money for basic health care.

In his budget the President needs to direct his efforts toward bridging the gap between the level of health care provided to those in need. His budget does not seriously attempt to address America's crisis in health care.

In order to meet the urgent needs of the American people, the CBC budget would provide \$10 billion in funds to provide health care services to those who are without coverage and other means to secure health services. Our budget would also provide \$500 million in consumer health programs with special attention to dietary and community mental health and enhancing family community violence prevention.

It appears that the message communicated so clearly by the Persian Gulf war has been forgotten. We must decrease our dependence on foreign oil. It is vital that we explore the use of alternative fuels, not only to ensure our national security, but to lessen the likelihood of an environmental catastrophe, and to conserve our natural resources.

Instead of following the administration's commitment to opening the Arctic wildlife refuge to oil drilling and in-

vesting in nuclear fission power, we need to redirect our investment toward research of renewable energy, alternative fuels, and energy conservation.

The use of renewable energy sources—solar, wind, hydroelectric, and geothermal energy—will decrease our dependence on exhaustible energy sources and create minimal pollution. Increased funding for conservation needs to become a priority. Becoming an energy-efficient nation will reduce our foreign oil dependency, as will research in alternative fuels.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget begins to address our Nation's energy needs. It reduces R&D in nuclear fission by 25 percent, increases R&D for alternative fuels by \$218 million, and increases funding for conservation by \$123 million.

My colleagues, please seriously consider adoption of this measure for the sake of America. We must beat down the monster the administration's poor choices have kept alive.

This budget not only addresses the society's present ills, but will provide the needed boost to propel our Nation into the dynamic and global community.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take a very close look and give deep consideration to adopting the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Coalition budget today.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I have looked through the budget that has been presented here, and it makes sense in a great number of ways, there is no denying that.

I would like to ask a specific question. I have found nothing in here, and perhaps it exists, about the transition from the military bases which necessarily will have to, even with our ongoing program and with whatever the gentleman proposes, would have to be closed, as to whether or not there is any drawdown moneys or transfer moneys from the Pentagon budget to clean up hazardous waste sites that are created by the abandonment by the Pentagon of its own military bases that would be included in any shrinking of the Pentagon apparatus. I would like to know that, because I think it is very important, and if the gentleman from California can give me an answer, I would yield for that purpose.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield, yes. He has asked a very good question. We placed \$3.7 billion in toxic waste cleanup on military facilities in our budget so that they can be used for a higher and better purpose for civilians in the event that the military bases are closed.

The gentleman is correct, toxic waste is a problem. We put in \$3.7 billion to deal with it.

Mr. GEKAS. I could not locate it here, and separately, if the gentleman could just point it out to me, I will not take up the time of the House to do it. But if indeed then this budget should fail, and we go on to other things, I am asking the gentleman if he is willing to pursue a Chamber-wide effort to pluck out this particular proposal and see if it will run on its own merits, along with some other vehicle that might fly if indeed this should fail.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I will come back to my distinguished colleague and we will show him the place in the budget where that \$3.7 billion is.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I think we can find some small grounds for agreement here.

The cold war with the Soviet Union is over, and for 45 years we were the defenders of the free world.

The generation that fought and won the Second World War with such energy and determination turned America's war machine into the greatest economic engine the world had ever seen. Through the Marshall plan, we rebuilt friend and foe alike, we opened our market to their goods. The 20th century became known as the American century.

But now, as that century draws to a close, there are those who say our time has passed, America cannot compete anymore, our technology is lagging, our factories are obsolete. Some have even called our workers lazy.

It is clear we cannot rest on our past laurels or our past victories. As the competition of the 20th century was military and the cold war, the new threat, the competition of the 21st century will be economic.

The challenge for us today is to recognize that changes in the world demand changes here at home. We must turn our attention back home and embark on a Marshall plan for the Americas that will begin to rebuild our manufacturing base, invest in our people, and provide for our young folks to succeed.

Tomorrow belongs to those who seize the opportunities of today. Just when we need it, we have the opportunity. The end of the cold war gives us a chance to rebuild our Nation. If we ignore, if we lose this opportunity, we will condemn ourselves and our children to live in a second-rank Nation.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget best addresses the real needs of our future. The President's budget abandons the future to continued cold war with an enemy that no longer exists. The Bush budget accelerates the disinvestment of the 1980's.

The CBC budget recognizes the needs of the future and puts us on the path to economic vitality.

The choice is clear, two paths, more of the same for the Pentagon as funded

at cold war levels, or a Pentagon and a military adequate to meet the changed threat and \$10 billion more for education, training, and employment.

□ 1650

The same for the Pentagon cold war levels of spending, or \$3.5 billion more for community and regional development.

The same for the Pentagon cold war levels of funding, or \$14 billion more for health care in America.

The same cold war levels of spending for the Pentagon, or another \$5 billion to better house Americans.

Cold war levels of spending for the Pentagon, or \$2 billion more to make America energy independent and more secure.

The same for the Pentagon, or another \$3.5 billion for transportation.

And all of that, all of that investment, all that gain for the American people, and a decrease in the deficit. It sounds too good to be true, but it is not. Put our money where our mouth is, let us invest in America, put America back to work, rebuild the country, vote for the CBC budget.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, up until this budget came before us, I felt a little bit like Alice in Wonderland. I felt that the other budgets did not really deal with the realities of our time, and just listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] a couple of minutes ago as he got so agitated about communism and the need we have to stay tough and strong against communism, communism has been discredited, Mr. Chairman. We are in a different time, in a different place. People want to be like us. Russia wants to join NATO.

There is no more Warsaw Pact, and our biggest enemies, our biggest enemies today, are joblessness and homelessness and children who are in trouble and jobs that are going overseas, Mr. Chairman, and jobs that are not being created because we do not have any strategy and any plan.

What is so wonderful about this document and why I am so pleased to rise again in favor of it is because it has that vision. It has that strategy. It has that plan that no one else is really presenting.

You know, I waited to hear our President during the State of the Union Address, and he said, "I am about to tell you about my plan for this economy. I am calling it Operation Domestic Storm." So I listened for the winds of the storm, the winds of change. I listened very hard to the President, and when he got finished, I said, "You

know what, I do not think that was Operation Domestic Storm. I think that was Operation Domestic Sprinkle." Because really there were no winds of change. There was no vision.

In this Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive budget, there is that vision that we so desperately need.

I think it is time we say to our allies what I have recently said to my kids who are in their twenties: "We love you. We will always be there for you. We are your best friend. But pay your fair share."

Forty-five years of picking up the military bills for Europe and Japan, and they are terrific and we will always be there for them, but now is the time for them to pay their fair share, because, guess what, while we have been picking up the tab for their military, they have been educating their children, they have been supporting their industries with an enlightened industrial policy, they have been taking care of health care for their people. They do not have people without health care; they do not have people at the emergency room door. Because why? Uncle Sam has been paying their bills.

I want to go back to being Uncle Sam. I do not want to be Uncle Sucker anymore.

It is time to take care of our own. This budget does it. I am proud to stand in favor of it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, on this alternative budget, I am reminded of the fellow who had a date with Siamese twins and was asked if he had a good time. He said, "Yes and no."

There are things in the alternative budget that I do not like particularly. There are things in all the budgets I do not particularly like. But there is one thing in the alternative budget that I really like, and that is a recognition of just what our situation is in NATO.

Even at the height of the cold war, it did not make a lot of sense for the United States to maintain 300,000 American military personnel and their dependents in Europe, because it was costing then about \$175 billion a year. Right now I would say it is probably costing at least one-third of the defense budget.

Now, you say that that is a great way to waste money, but remember, it does not just waste money. It contributes mightily to the balance-of-payments deficit of our country just as though you had bought \$125 billion worth of Toyotas or Hondas. That is a bad idea.

Now, you go to the military experts and say what were the 300,000 for in the first place. They could not stop a juggernaut from the East rolling across Europe. Well, I will tell you why we maintained them over there, because

they are hostages to prove to the Europeans that if the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming and attack, and an attack that never happened, if the Russians are coming, that we will use our nuclear weapons to protect the people of Europe. This proves it to them.

I said, "OK, if you are going to use hostages, if that is your theory, call up Raquel Welch." You remember "The Odyssey" and Homer and all that writing, the Face That Launched a Thousand Ships, pay her a billion a year to sit around in Germany someplace. She can be the hostage. That will prove to the Europeans that we will use our nuclear weapons.

We are here now, no cold war, no Warsaw Pact, still hanging in there with a balance-of-payments deficit, still hanging in there with all of these people over there in Europe.

All right, let me just finish with this: there was a fellow who showed his friend through his house one time. He said, "Here is the new house; here is our family room; here is our dining room, and here is the kitchen." And they went into the study, and there was a woman sitting on the sofa kissing some man, and he said, "That is my wife," and so they went on into the kitchen, and they sat down at the kitchen table and the host took a pot of coffee and poured a cup for his friend and poured a cup for himself, and the friend could not stand it anymore. He said, "What about the guy in the dining room?" And the host said, "Let him get his own coffee."

Now, that is the way I feel about the Europeans who are rich as can be. We are the biggest debtor nation on Earth. I am for this substitute.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCCOIN].

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues what a budget for a country and for a society is. It is not just a ledger. It is not just a column of numbers with subtotals and grand totals. It is that, of course. But it is a lot more than that.

Because what a budget truly is for a nation, for a society, is a strategic document. It is a strategic document that affects the lives of every single citizen in an economic sense and in a social sense.

Before us today is an alternative to the strategic document of the Reagan and Bush years, a strategic document that I would call the grand heist of the 1980's, where we had the largest transfer of wealth from the middle class and from the working poor to the richest of the rich, perhaps in my lifetime.

I just want to show my colleagues who benefited from the budget policies of the 1980's. This chart, based on data

from the Congressional Budget Office, shows where the budget priorities of the past 11 years have gotten us. The richest 1 percent of families received 60 percent of the aftertax income gain and 14 percent of the aftertax income gain went to families in the top 2- to 5-percent bracket. And those with incomes in the top 6 percent to 20 percent received 20 percent of the aftertax income gain during this time.

So, in terms of the wealth that was generated, based on the strategic budgets of the Reagan-Bush years, that is who won, and I want to tell you who the victims are. The victims are dislocated workers, hard-working Americans who have lost their jobs throughout Oregon and across this Nation. The victims are the middle class—which has shrunk by 20 percent during this past decade. When we pass this budget today, we'll be making a strong statement that Robin Hood in reverse must stop. It makes no sense for middle-income Americans to pay for the lifestyles of the rich and famous.

I say it is time for a change.

The tax and budget policies of the Reagan and Bush administrations have allowed the millionaires in this country to rob hard-working Americans of their jobs, their savings, and their future. Since 1977 to 1989, the income of the super rich has grown by 77 percent. At the same time, the income of the average American family was barely keeping up with inflation. And, it's no surprise that low-income families have lost big.

What's the result? In Oregon, more than 121,700 people are out of work. More than 13 million children in this country—1 in 5—live in poverty. Thirty-seven million Americans have no health coverage. Every night, at least 1,000 children are without a home to sleep in. We're only able to serve about one-third of the children eligible for Head Start.

Nearly 20 percent of the Nation's students don't finish high school, and only 40 percent of our high school graduates go on to college. This is the tab that every American has to pay for the decade of letting the good times roll for a few high rollers.

So what's the answer? Let's face it. There isn't one right answer—there are a lot of right answers. Much of the problem lies with the private sector where corporate executives are making millions while closing plants, moving operations overseas, and laying off thousands of workers. We've simply got to stop rewarding these activities through massive tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this budget we are debating today is the first budget we are presented with in the post-cold war era. It poses this question: Do we continue to defend ourselves against enemies that no longer exist, or do we begin to arm ourselves for the economic war that we truly do face today

and will face in the 21st century? I think it should be the latter, and I think that is why these alternative budgets are so imperative.

Our Nation's threat today comes not from an evil empire, but from within our own borders. We are unable today in America to compete in the global marketplace. Our economy has stalled. People have seen their standards of living sink and now they are afraid of losing their jobs and their homes. We need a change.

We stand at a crossroads—a crossroads between the cold war and a new century. Between a narrow vision stuck in cold war thinking, and bold leadership focused on tomorrow.

This Congress must get beyond the rhetoric of an administration that refuses to face the fact that people across this country are confused, afraid, and are concerned about their future and the future of their children. It's time to show the American people that this House has listened and is prepared to seize the day and chart a new course for this Nation. We can begin by recognizing that the cold war is over and that Reaganomics has meant real pain and suffering for America's working families.

Here in this House, the people's House, this budget vote is an opportunity to answer some of the questions. Our national budget must set new priorities. It must move our economy forward, create jobs, invest in education, and ensure a recovery that will last. It must provide relief to our children, families, and communities.

That's why we must rip up the obsolete 1990 budget agreement and start fresh. It's now time for real cuts in defense spending. I support a military cut of 60 percent over the next 5 years, freeing up \$1.1 trillion by the year 2000. What better legacy could we provide our children then to start the 21st century with good schools, health care that works, and an economic base that means real jobs with real family wages?

We must begin that journey today. Both the Black Caucus budget and the Democratic alternative, which doesn't come close to the defense cuts that I support, set us on that road. In my home State of Oregon, the Democratic alternative would mean access to basic health and nutrition programs for kids. It would mean better schools, and it would mean that 3,000 more poor children will get food through the WIC Program.

It would mean 6,000 more students will get financial aid to go to college. It would mean 3,500 more people will get job training. And even the Democratic alternative would mean that our schools will get real help—8,000 more students can get vocational training. We could enroll 700 more children in Head Start programs.

The Democratic alternative would mean over \$11.6 million to Oregon

schools to help improve the educational performance of low-income and special needs students.

Mr. Chairman, in 10 years, the test of our leadership will be whether we have a nation of healthy, well-educated children and productive workers, whether our families have hope for the future and are able to care for themselves, whether other countries fear the power and ability of the American worker. This is our challenge. We have the resources. Do we have the courage to stand and deliver?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for a very thoughtful piece of work and for the work of the gentleman who is managing the time; the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has been consistently thoughtful and precise in the military area.

I want to address one aspect of this, if I can. Obviously, I cannot do it all at once.

I think many of my colleagues have made very clear the extent to which the threat has diminished substantially and the extent to which we have a right to ask our wealthy allies to get off the dole. I do not think there is much doubt that in 5 years from now if we have a military half of what we now have we would be by far the strongest nation in the world and well able by a considerable margin to defend ourselves.

We had a war with Iraq which lasted less time than any I have heard from the Secretary of Defense in testimony. We are told we have to be careful about the next level of threat, like Iran. Iran lost a war to Iraq. I do not think we are being unserious when we say a military half our current size would be well able to protect us.

So then the argument is, but what about the economic effect of cutting the military? Note that that argument comes from people who have from the time of the 1980's regarded almost all aspects of Government spending as a severe drain on the economy. We have got one of the great acts of gymnastics in American history being performed in this Chamber today. Members who for years have treated Government as a subtraction from the sum of economic activity have suddenly discovered in public works an economic virtue heretofore unknown to them. All of a sudden this Government which causes economic problems, which was a drain on the economy, which held back growth, is in fact the best way to make jobs. It is the Government which is not only the best way to make jobs, but the best way to educate young people, to enspirited them, to teach them the values of family and patriotism.

I welcome my conservative colleagues as converts to recognizing that government, along with the private sector, has a distinct positive role in our society; but sometimes when people become converts, they go from one extreme to the other without stopping at an appropriate middle point.

Yes, money spent by the Government on the military has some job-creating aspects, but over the long haul, it is a less efficient way to do that than many other ways.

We must not confuse two aspects. There is a short-term degree of pain that will come whenever you make very substantial cuts. Some of us, when Members here were voting for the Gramm-Latta bill which threw people out of work, terminated programs abruptly, severely reduced services, we tried to make that point. Apparently some of our friends were a little slow on the uptake, so it took up until now to get our point.

We agree that there is a problem when people are thrown out of work, and we have provisions in the budget here and any other budget that I have supported that would deal with it; but over the long term, when you consider two points, first the largest amount of dollars in this economy's budget are spent overseas in the military budget; more money is spent overseas and not among the poor, but among the wealthy. Bring that money home and you will stimulate the American economy.

Second, as Alan Greenspan said when I asked him the question, "Reducing the military and using that money elsewhere"—and there is the flaw in their logic. They assume that if we reduce the military, the money will be put somewhere in a very big mattress.

The fact is we are not spending it. We are redirecting it, some to the private sector, some to the public sector.

As Alan Greenspan noted, military spending is primarily insurance spending. It is money you spend in the hope you will not have to use it. By taking a reduction there, plausibly over the long haul, Members should note, reflecting the expertise of the gentleman from California, this budget cuts budget authority for the long haul much, much more than it cuts the short-term outlays.

It is in fact a responsible way to improve the American economy by shifting resources, not burying them, to more productive uses.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I rise in strong support of the Black Caucus alternative budget. I want to commend the floor manager, the gentleman from California, and I also want

to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], who worked on crafting this budget for us.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of its name, the Congressional Black Caucus alternate budget is not a black budget.

Instead, it is a visionary blueprint for a post cold war America.

It is a document that examines the financial resources available to our Nation now that the Soviet threat is no more. And it examines these resources in light of the pressing human problems with which millions of good and decent Americans must grapple every day—homelessness, joblessness, and a loss of our competitive standing around the world.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternate budget recognizes the economic crisis facing America. This budget tackles the crisis head-on and reflects a bedrock belief in the inherent greatness of this country.

There are serious economic challenges facing our country, Mr. Chairman, and this budget addresses them with courage and vision.

It does this by injecting urgently needed equity into our tax system.

It does this by boosting the American worker's competitiveness in the international arena.

It does this by ensuring that the young bright minds of our country receive the high quality of education that they deserve.

And it does this without compromising one iota of our national security.

The 21st century demands that America be at the cutting edge of technology, Mr. Chairman. The 21st century demands that the American people have a health care system on par with that of our major trading partners. And the 21st century demands that the U.S. Government face up to its responsibilities to get our economy moving again. The Congressional Black Caucus budget meets all of these challenges and I commend Chairman ED TOWNS of New York for leading us in crafting this alternate budget.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from California for yielding this time to me and congratulate him for all of his hard work on this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the Towns-Dellums proposal is fair, it is appropriate, and it is just in light of the revolutionary changes that we have witnessed on this planet during the past few years.

I agree, the cold war is over. The Berlin Wall is down. The Soviet empire does not exist anymore. The Russians are not coming. They are gone.

This budget is saying that war is obsolete as a tool of our foreign policy.

This budget is saying, this proposal is saying the time has come for us to stop spending so much of our limited resources on building more bombs, more missiles, and more guns. This budget is saying let us rebuild America, let us rebuild our infrastructure, and provide housing for the homeless.

This budget, this proposal is saying let us educate all of our children.

It is saying let us provide comprehensive health care for all Americans.

This budget is saying let us take care of the elderly, the disabled.

In essence, this budget is saying let us look out for those who have been left out and left behind.

This budget is also saying let us clean up the environment and leave this little planet a little cleaner, a little safer, a little greener.

With this budget proposal, we look ahead to the future with a sense of vision, with a sense of purpose, with a sense of direction. With this budget we will rebuild America. We will build a new America and we will seek to build a new world, a world at peace with itself.

I ask you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to support the Towns-Dellums budget amendment.

□ 1710

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment my distinguished colleague for an extraordinary statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, may I begin by thanking the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for the process he has so eloquently and analytically initiated here this day.

Mr. Chairman, I come before this body with what I believe to be the most dramatic evidence of the disinvestment of the United States of America over the last dozen years in the American people. We have disinvested most where we have needed to invest the most, in the counties, in the cities, and towns of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this chart dramatically points up that decline, a decline, I submit, worse than any decline we have seen in Federal revenue.

Moreover, the Congressional Black Caucus budget seeks, in a very partial and moderate way, to make up for this catastrophic disinvestment but to begin what will surely be too slow a process to restore some balance in our expenditures.

During the last dozen years, while we have been reading the lips of those who brought us to this point, we have been paying for what the Federal Government paid for in 1981. After all, these are the years in which we have seen the outpouring of unprecedented problems. In 1980, there was no outbreak of AIDS; in 1980, the drug culture had not taken root; in 1980, we had not seen drive-by shootings. It is in these places where we have seen them, and while I would never make the case that there is a direct correlation between investment and crime, I would surely make the case that the disinvestment, particularly from the cities of the United States, is certainly not unrelated to the terrible crime those cities have experienced.

This very day, I became a cosponsor of the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for a Select Committee on Violence, a committee that will try to bring sanity to the discussion of crime in the cities.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen Federal assistance to priority municipal programs dropped from almost \$50 billion in 1981 to \$19.1 billion in 1990. That includes money for transit, for sewage and the rest, and this does not.

There is a bill sponsored by Mr. CONYERS, the Local Partnership Act of 1992, which would try to make up, to begin to make up, for this 40-percent decline in our investment where it is needed the most.

Mr. Chairman, your effort helps us to get our balance, to see what has been lost, so that we can begin a process that already we now see is too late to begin. But too late is better than never. The CBC budget allows us to begin too late, and I appreciate the process that you have begun for us.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just rise to commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, our spokesman on this matter on the floor, my good colleague from California, of the Progressive Caucus of the House, for proposing this alternative, particularly because here they have their priorities straight. They substantially reduce the defense budget to provide for education, housing, job needs, and also propose to cut the military portion of our foreign aid and to reallocate it to a fair amount for Africa and the Caribbean.

I urge my colleagues to support this alternative.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, it is now my distinct pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and commend him for his leadership on this very important issue before us today. I commend him and the Congressional Black Caucus for this alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus alternative budget. I am pleased to join with my esteemed colleagues, Representatives TOWNS and DELLUMS in bringing this budget for new realities and for rebuilding America to the floor today.

For decades, we lived in a world framed by the parameters of the cold war. It was a world of them and us. We are seeing in our lives fundamental, world shaking changes which have brought physical, ideological, and eco-

conomic walls down. Some of these changes go well beyond what many could have even imagined or begun to hope for. Because of these changes, we are fortunate to have the opportunity to restructure the nature of our national policy and spending priorities. We cannot let this opportunity go by unheeded.

There is a great deal at stake here at home. If we do not act affirmatively to change dramatically our spending priorities, we will do the future of this Nation a grave disservice. The parameters have shifted. The world of them and us we must confront today is our own domestic agenda. Our enemies are poverty, ignorance, and social injustice. If we do the hard work of addressing these problems, our global competitiveness will improve automatically.

We have the opportunity now, to make the priorities of this budget reflect the values of the people of this country. We must ask ourselves, what kind of America do we want?

In today's America, more than 13 million children live in poverty. This is 3 million more children than were poor in 1980. One in every five children in America is poor. In our cities, the number rises to one in three children. Is this the kind of America we want?

In today's America, more than 100,000 children are homeless every night. At the same time, the foster care system is overwhelmed by constantly increasing numbers of children in need of care. About 406,000 children are in foster care—almost a 50-percent increase from the mid-1980's. For a country that prides itself on family values, is this the kind of America we want?

In today's America, 40 percent of all American children younger than 18 lacked employer-based health insurance coverage, despite the fact that the majority of them are in working families. Of the 46 million children who have had private health insurance coverage during 1990, approximately 43 percent will experience some period without health coverage by the end of this year. Is this the kind of America we want?

This alternative budget answers these questions with a resounding no and proposes a sound and realistic way to reshape our national budget to meet our pressing needs. It would make significant and responsible cuts in defense spending, partnered with serious and effective economic conversion plans to shift our emphasis from the military to the people. At the same time, it would provide much needed spending for our children, for health care, for housing, and for education. It would increase funding for Head Start by \$2.1 billion; for education by over \$4 billion; for community development block grants by \$834 million; and in addition to significantly increasing the funding levels necessary to maintain current services in health programs, would provide \$10

billion for a new program to provide health care services to those without them, as well as increasing AIDS research funding by \$1.4 billion and AIDS treatment funding by \$500 million.

We must search our souls as well as our pockets as we determine this Nation's funding priorities. I urge my colleagues to fight against the increasing polarization between the wealthy and the poor in this Nation, to fight the tide of us and them, and to act today to pass a budget to meet the needs of the people of this Nation. We expect the best of our children, how can we provide all of our children with anything but the best? What we have provided, so far, falls far short. I urge my colleagues to support this alternative budget. It recognizes that we are living in a new world and promotes the values we need to thrive in it.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished coauthor of the budget alternative before the body at this time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to first commend the gentleman and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and members of the Progressive Caucus for all the work they have done over the past few months.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this is a fair budget, and I hope our colleagues will look at it and make the decision to support it.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation's economy is currently teetering on a cliff. But if we are strong and regain our direction and steady our balance, we will not fall. But make no mistake, if we look away, we will take a headlong plunge.

I submit to you that today we have the opportunity to make the worst times of unemployment, homelessness, inadequate access to health care and a crumbling infrastructure into a spring of hope for all Americans and especially our children. We all can remember our childhood. Maybe some of us can remember the Depression. These were tough times. But we must all recognize that the current realities of our children's lives are bleak at best. Here are the realities:

Bread for the World's Institute on Hunger and Development estimates that in this country 13 million children go to bed hungry every night because of inadequate resources for food programs.

We talk about the scourge of crack on our children yet we have not considered the long-term effects of the scourge of poverty. On February 7, 1991, the New York Times reported that it is difficult, if not impossible to differentiate symptoms of poverty, malnutrition, and inadequate prenatal care from those of prenatal crack exposure.

In 1990, the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies released a study showing that changing employment opportunities determine the fate of children.

Of all families, young black families have lost the most ground.

This is a fair budget—for all Americans, the income gap between rich and poor widened in the 1980's with average incomes increasing 122 percent for the top 1 percent of households but falling 10 percent for the bottom 20 percent.

We must change the economic reality of America before the underclass becomes deeply entrenched and deeply embittered. We can only do this by breaking down the artificial wall which we imposed in the budget—a wall built upon the philosophical foundation that the world would not change. But it has. And just as surely as the walls which separated East Germany from West Germany were made to fall—these walls must also fall. On one side of the wall we have astronomical defense spending where there is no threat to American peace and freedom and on the other side of the wall we have a depleted economy and the highest unemployment rate in recent memory. The wall must fall because American industry must be given an opportunity to pursue a domestic buildup with the same zeal which permitted a military buildup. The walls must fall because the foundations are gone. The walls must fall because they are no longer keeping Congress within a discipline, but are keeping the American people out of prosperity. The survival and prosperity of the average American today and in the future depends on our ability to take on the same kind of peacetime conversion of resources now as we did following World War II. We must mobilize to save our national agenda with the same zeal that we used to save Kuwait. Once the walls are torn down, we can begin to build roads, bridges, homes, jobs, and lives by distributing money from programs which world events have rendered obsolete to projects which are vital to the lifeblood of many communities.

The world has changed. We must have the courage and foresight to change with it. America has been a world leader for the 20th century. We can maintain our position of prominence if we use this moment to invest in our future through investing in education for our people and research, development, and capital for our industries. Today, by supporting the Towns-Dellums budget we will preserve our role as world leaders.

□ 1720

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] if he is prepared to make a closing statement at this point?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. MFUME]. Yes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, unless the Chair corrects me, as I understand it, we have 2 minutes remaining. By a previous agreement with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], if he would yield 5 minutes to us, that would give us 7 minutes. It would be my intention to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON], I would take the final 4 minutes, and that would close off debate on our side.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and I yield back such other time beyond that as may be remaining on our side.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] for his generosity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my friend, for yielding this time to me. What I will try to do in the 3 minutes for the people who have not had an opportunity to watch for the last 7 hours that we have been here talking about this is to summarize, and I realize that 3 minutes is not nearly enough time to summarize.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "If you believe that our best and brightest scientists could be put to work in this country curing diseases like breast cancer, and AIDS and Alzheimer's disease; instead of building bombs, helping to cure our problems in our environment and find new technologies and new fuels, conserve our resources, build sewage plants, deal with pollution and agriculture research, then now is the time for America. If you believe that our best industries should be building televisions, and VCR's and computers instead of buying them from people abroad, and building railroad coaches, and mass transit systems, and commercial and private airplanes instead of bombers, then now is the time. If you believe that our industry can and should find housing and build housing for our people, help rebuild our family farmers, then now is the time for America. If you believe that our military men and women ought to be allowed to teach in our urban and rural schools where we don't have enough teachers, to work in our hospitals in urban and rural America where they are closing every day, to retrain each other and be given an opportunity for new job training, then now is the time. If you believe that the best problem solvers who solve all the problems for the rest of the world can be put to work building our educational system, keeping Medicare for our older people, eliminating gang violence, doing something about drugs, fully funding Head Start, keeping Social Security where people can live an honest,

decent existence, building up veterans benefits, then now is the time to stand up for America."

Mr. Chairman, that is the choice. No one who has an opportunity to vote can go home and say, "We didn't have a choice." They have military spending cuts of \$50 billion on one side that ought and should be directed to the people in this country. If there ever was a time to stand up for America, to stand up for our own, to work for the people inside our borders, then now is the time. Now is the time to stand up for America.

George Wallace said a long time ago, and I say it today, "Stand up for America. Have the courage to do what's right. Vote for this budget, not because of whoever's name is on it, but because you have an opportunity to redirect the interests of our Government from the military-industrial complex to the pride that we once had after World War II."

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have now come to the closing moments of this debate. As I have said on more than one occasion, perhaps the most important activity that we can engage in as public officials is to adopt a national budget because where a nation puts its money is a statement about its priorities, which in turn is a statement about its values.

Mr. Chairman, we have attempted in bringing a budget to our colleagues to lay out what we perceive to be our values. We understand that there will be Members on both sides of the aisle that will have legitimate intellectual, political and economic differences with what we have stated. But at least we have taken this moment to say to our colleagues, "Let's rise above our partisanship, let's rise above our political views and come together realizing the magnificence of the historical moment within which we find ourselves."

This is a moment pregnant with great potential. On a personal note, I have been waiting 21 years for this moment, to be able to come into this well and say, "There's no longer the Communist menace and the Soviet threat, so let's not use that as a rationalization for not addressing the myriad social and economic problems that have plagued this Nation for decades and now manifest themselves in extraordinary pain and misery as we move forward into the 21st century."

Mr. Chairman, we have expended between \$150 and \$210 billion per annum focusing on a Warsaw Pact threat that no longer exists, a Soviet Union threat that has grossly diminished. If we can spend on an annual basis each year for

the last 10 years between \$150 and \$210 billion looking at a threat that is no longer there, can we not now in 1993 take \$50 billion and redirect it to begin to address the human condition of our Nation? To give our children back their dreams? To give our workers back their work? To give our Nation back its pride? Not building B-2's and MX's, but building a magnificent way of life?

Mr. Chairman, our budget is an effort to say, "Let's rebuild the economic infrastructure of this Nation. Let's reinvest in the human potential of our children and the American people. We don't need to continue to go down this road in lockstep, in cold war politics. It's over. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists. The Soviet Union no longer exists."

I say to my colleagues, "Let's seize this great moment, seize this great moment to take a major step in a radically new direction."

Mr. Chairman, I thank each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of this aisle, irrespective of their political views, for dignifying this moment, for coming here and engaging us in a substantive and serious debate. It was not substantive enough, not serious enough, not embracing enough, my colleagues, but it was a start, and understand that we are here for the long haul. If it took us 21 years to get to this moment, if it takes us 21 more, we are going to keep hammering home until we wake up to the reality that the war of the future is not nuclear weapons, and fighting communism and beating up on the Soviet Union, but fighting against homelessness, and helplessness, and human misery, and unemployment and all the significant problems that we need to address.

I say to my colleagues, "This budget we put before you is, A, a new reality, a new world reality budget; B, an effort to reinvest in America, and I thank you for this moment and thank you for your support."

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise and commend the excellent work of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus in preparing this fiscal year 1993 budget alternative, Mr. TOWNS for his leadership of the caucus this Congress, and Mr. DELLUMS for his tireless effort spearheading the creation of this important document.

This is perhaps the most important annual activity of the Congressional Black Caucus—the preparation of a blueprint that represents the best in American values; a statement of the direction this country needs to take to rebuild our economy, restore fairness and balance to our priorities, redefine the meaning of national security, and provide compassion and opportunity to all our citizens. One has to start with the budget of the Nation, which represents nearly one-quarter of all spending in this economy.

Mr. Chairman, we have three major deficits in this country—a deficit of the spirit, a deficit in our social and economic fabric caused by a decade of disinvestment, and a deficit of the

budget. I believe this budget addresses all three deficits.

DEFICIT OF THE SPIRIT

The Federal budget not only sets a course for the Nation, it also states the values we hold dear, and the dreams we aspire to. Once again our President, like the President before him, has proposed a budget that favors the rich and leaves crumbs for the rest of America. His budget and its tax program would once again put a strong wind at the backs of wealthy investors, and a headwind of hurricane force against hardworking Americans.

Frankly, I'm fed up with the arrogant and cynical leadership from the White House which continues to run the Government as if it were a playground for millionaires, rather than at the service of all Americans. The Congressional Black Caucus budget will reverse such a selfish and constricted view of the world, and bring Americans together, rather than divide us.

DEFICIT IN OUR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FABRIC

Mr. Chairman, we have just come through a decade of disinvestment. Reaganomics I and II have bushwhacked the economy and starved critical areas of investment that would promote economic growth, make us more competitive in the world, aid people in need, and reduce the deficit.

This deficit has raised the crime rate, contributed to the decline of our family structure, and resulted in increased racism. The cold war was borne on the backs of families, low-income and working Americans.

We would need to spend \$77 billion more for investment programs in 1993 than the President has proposed just to get us back to the 1980 level of Federal spending on investment. We are not talking poor people's programs here, Mr. Chairman. We're talking about infrastructure, education, job training, science and technology, economic development, and selected health and housing programs.

DEFICIT OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, for too long the poor have been scapegoated as the cause of the budget deficit. In his State of the Union Address the President made an assault on welfare recipients as if they were the cause of the budget deficit.

There are three main causes of the deficit, all due to Republican policies of the 1980's:

Tax breaks for the rich: Some estimate \$750 billion in giveaways were made;

Huge increases in military spending: doubling of the budget; and

Deregulation, which created the \$500 billion S&L debacle, and the declining economy have caused the deficit to balloon.

There are two, interrelated solutions to the deficit:

First, we need to make the economy grow faster to increase revenues. The only way to do that is to increase investments in people, technology, and infrastructure to make our workers productive and our economy strong. This requires us to spend money in the short term to save money in the long term. This is a fundamental of all healthy businesses.

Second, we need the resources to make those new investments and to directly start paying off the deficit. There are only two ways

to get those resources—raise taxes or reduce the military budget.

LET GO OF THE COLD WAR

The President's budget shaves only \$44 billion off a proposed \$1.5 trillion military budget over the next 5 years. That's a cut of only 3 percent. The excuses for these levels of spending have vanished. The Warsaw Pact has collapsed—we don't need to protect West Germany from East Germany. The Soviet Union has disintegrated—the hammer and sickle flag no longer flies over the Kremlin. The last time I looked the Russian leader was a capitalist, not a Communist.

We can let go of the President's plans to spend as much as \$42 billion a year for nuclear weapons. We don't need many of these weapons any more.

We can let go of the President's plans to spend as much as \$86 billion a year for the defense of Europe. Europe can defend itself, from itself.

We can let go of the President's plans to spend \$32 billion for the defense of Japan and Korea. Japan and Korea have grown rich under our expensive defensive shield. Let them defend themselves.

We no longer need to defend Germany and Japan from a Soviet threat that no longer exists while they win over our markets. We can do better. We can safely cut defense. We can make the hard choices and terminate weapons we no longer need.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget does better. It makes the hard choices and chooses wisely. And the thrust of the Black Caucus budget is supported by recognized defense experts. For instance, the Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Director John Steinbruner estimates that we can cut the military budget in half over the next 5 years and realize defense savings of \$500 to \$700 billion over the course of the decade and \$100 billion each year, thereafter. Dr. Steinbruner has proposed a Brookings budget that comes very close to the plan advanced today by the Congressional Black Caucus.

We can do better than the President. We can do better than trimming 3 percent off the Pentagon budget. Let go of the cold war. Come on up to the new realities.

And let's not forget that we need economic conversion to cushion the hardship to families and communities caused by defense cutbacks. The CBC budget provides for this.

LOCAL PARTNERSHIP ACT

The Congressional Black Caucus budget calls for \$2 billion in fiscal year 1993 for the Local Partnership Act [LPA], H.R. 3601, as compared to nothing under the concurrent resolution recommended by the Committee on the Budget.

The CBC budget is preferable because the LPA addresses two problems which everyone agrees must be solved. One is the recession, and the other is the impact of converting to an economy that is not dependent on the cold war.

We are clearly in a recession. The number of full-time jobs in the country has declined by 2,300,000 since May 1990. While many economists believe the recession will end this year, these same economists last spring said that the recession would end last year. It would, therefore, be prudent for us to prepare

to further stimulate the economy this fall if these economists are again wrong in their forecasts.

Testimony before the Committee on Government Operations confirms what every local newspaper is reporting: The recession is squeezing the finances of local governments, which are confronted by lower tax receipts and greater demand for public services.

Title I of the LPA, as approved last week by the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, authorizes an appropriation for fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993 of \$15 billion to be sent directly to 39,000 local governments. The money is to be sent to the local governments by the Secretary of the Treasury within 60 days after it is appropriated, and the local governments must return the funds to Washington if they are not actually spent within a year. The local government must rehire laid off workers, restore services, or expand programs that are overburdened because of the recession. The funds must be spent on education, public safety, health, social services such as emergency food and shelter, and programs mandated by the Federal Government such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The LPA has several advantages. It will get the money out quickly. The formula allocates the money to the parts of the country where unemployment is the highest, and this includes areas hurt by cuts in the defense budget. The formula also allocates more funds to local governments with more low-income residents, and it rewards local self-help, by giving more funds to local governments that impose high taxes relative to residents' income. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that title I of the LPA will create 325,000 new jobs this year.

In conclusion, the Local Partnership Act is a way of helping to end the recession by lifting the fiscal siege of our local governments.

CONCLUSION

This is an alternative that members should support. The merits are on its side. The changing world argues for it. Everyone intuitively knows that today we need to be bold, that we need to be courageous. This is how we can do it.

It is a budget that recognizes what the President has failed to recognize: That we have fundamentally two economic problems, one short term and the other long term. In the short term this budget creates the necessary economic stimulus and jobs. And if you care about jobs, it will create many more than any other offered.

This alternative also begins the process of long-term investments in human needs, education, health care, and jobs. The neglect of these investments, together with trickle-down economics, have created an economic mudslide in the past decade.

We today have two options: We can lead or we can follow a dramatically changing world. The President's budget does not lead; it's simply more of the same budgetary policy that's not working. The CBC alternative charts a new course. Let's get this country moving again with it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Black Caucus budget

substitute offered to day by Mr. TOWNS and Mr. DELLUMS. This budget substitute offers a true vision of this Nation's future and is the only real product before the House which makes the genuine hard choices required of leadership.

The Towns-Dellums substitute would allow this Nation to reap the greatest benefit from the peace dividend. By redirecting Pentagon savings of \$2.6 billion toward student financial assistance, the substitute would make college a reality for the children of millions of hard-working American families.

By redirecting Pentagon savings of \$1.4 billion toward education block grants to States, the substitute will provide the impetus for educational reform for every American public school, not just for a select few.

By redirecting Pentagon savings of \$2.1 billion toward Head Start, the substitute will make full funding for this critical school readiness program possible by fiscal year 1995.

By redirecting Pentagon savings of \$2 billion toward training and employment programs, and an additional \$1 billion for an economic conversion retraining program associated with reductions in military spending, the substitute will bring jobs to the unemployed and hope to the displaced and will allow this Nation to re-tool for a peacetime economy.

Mr. Chairman, the Towns-Dellums substitute offers bold leadership on a day when our President is apologizing for what may have inadvertently been taken for leadership in the budget agreement for this Nation's future 2 years ago. True leadership does not come cheaply. True leadership means a willingness to lead. True leadership means never having to say you're sorry.

It is time that we got on with leading this country into the future by investing in America now. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Towns-Dellums substitute.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the House must face reality. We cannot meet the basic needs of the American people unless we tear down the artificial budget walls established in 1990.

Let no one doubt that defense spending will be cut. Both the changing international scene and our own domestic needs require this action. The only question is how we will choose to allocate the billions of dollars saved through defense spending reductions.

The 1990 budget agreement protects defense, domestic, and international spending by building paper walls that prohibit using savings in one area to meet real needs in another. These budget walls perpetuate Federal spending priorities which do not reflect the post-cold-war world.

I support using these defense spending savings to meet the priority needs of the American people. Under the House budget plan A, the House can provide increased funding for vital programs such as education, Head Start, nutrition programs for women and children, transportation, health care, and job training. At the same time, we will still provide for deficit reduction.

Unless the House accepts this plan, funding for basic domestic programs will be \$6.4 billion less than what is needed to simply maintain current services. All of the savings from defense cuts would go to deficit reduction, but at what price?

We must choose whether schoolchildren will have the resources they require to learn, and whether mothers and their infants will have food. We must choose whether we will rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, and provide workers with the skills they need to succeed in today's economy.

I support deficit reduction, but I cannot turn my back on the needs of American families. Under plan A, walls down, we can begin to serve these families and still use part of the defense savings to reduce the deficit. Plan B, walls up, means a real reduction in services. It is the men, women, and children of our own communities who will suffer unless we tear down the budget walls. The walls must come down now to build a stronger America.

Still, the debate on the budget resolution is more than simply a debate over budget walls. It is also a debate over the size of the peace dividend.

While the House Budget Committee's plan A points in the right direction by bringing down the budget walls, it does not go far enough in providing a sufficient peace dividend to meet the basic needs of America. The problem is that the recommended level of defense spending—\$287.2 billion—does not reflect actual defense requirements. Under plan A, defense spending will still be too high to provide the savings needed to invest in America's future.

What we need is defense spending that is driven by the real national security threat we face today. The Congressional Black Caucus budget substitute offered by Representatives TOWNS and DELLUMS offers the House a defense budget which reflects the reality of a post-cold-war world. I believe that a \$275.5 billion defense budget is more than adequate to meet U.S. defense needs at a time when we stand unchallenged as the world's only true superpower.

The Towns-Dellums substitute would use these savings to provide the resources vitally needed to build a stronger and more just America. This proposal would provide the funds needed to educate our children, rebuild our Nation's industrial base, train our workers, and provide jobs for Americans.

The House must choose whether we will respond to the needs of Americans who want a job and a better standard of living for their families. We no longer face a cold war threat, but we do face an economic threat.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to put taxpayer's dollars to work where they will do the most good. The time has come to bring down the walls and enact a budget which serves the needs of the American people.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Towns-Dellums/Black Caucus substitute to House Concurrent Resolution 287, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1993. Of all the plans submitted in the committee resolution and in amendments to the resolution, the Black Caucus substitute would support the largest increase in domestic spending. This increase would be funded by a cut in defense spending, one significantly greater than that found in the committee resolution. In addition to much-needed increases in entitlement and domestic discretionary spending, this substitute would offer tax relief for middle-income and working class families.

With the collapse of the Soviet threat, the world has entered into dramatically different

circumstances than those that existed during the cold war. Though a strong defense should remain a budgetary priority, we must refocus our primary energy on building a strong domestic economy. In order to spur our economic growth, immediate investment in our Nation's infrastructure through housing construction, transportation improvement and community and regional development must be provided.

The time has come to address the serious economic conditions which have brought hardship to so many Americans. To accomplish this vital goal, increased funding for health, education and job-training programs is urgently needed. The funding levels contained in some of the plans offered for this budget resolution would place these programs in jeopardy, leaving them millions of dollars short of what is needed just to maintain current services, let alone expand services to those who lack them. The Black Caucus substitute offers the highest levels of funding for these priority programs.

The enactment of this substitute, and certain other budget resolution plans that have been offered, depends on the elimination of the firewalls established by the 1990 budget agreement to allow the transfer of funds from defense to domestic needs. I also offer my unconditional support for the passage of this legislation. The creation of the divided spending categories was based on dramatically different international and domestic conditions than those that exist today and our budgetary system must be modified accordingly.

I call on my colleagues to join me in support of the Towns-Dellums/Black Caucus substitute to the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1993.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. I would like to commend Congressmen TOWNS and DELLUMS for offering an alternative budget that reflects a more realistic and forward-thinking picture of Federal budget priorities, and I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very important amendment.

I would also like to recognize the efforts of Chairman PANETTA and the Budget Committee for putting together a budget that lays a good foundation by which the CBC alternative budget is able to depart in a more progressive fashion. It is encouraging to see the Budget Committee move in a direction that many of us have pursued for years, but at a time when deep cuts in defense spending can lead to real investment in America, neither plan A nor plan B offers enough of a substantive change to meet the immediate and desperate challenges that currently face our society.

For 40 years, the American taxpayer paid for a massive defense buildup in the hopes that one day we could reap the benefits of a peaceful world. Today the new world has arrived. The cold war is over, democracy is sweeping the globe and the enemy of my people, is now my friend. Yet again each American is asked to be patient and wait a little longer. Meanwhile, the ground below is quickly crumbling, the surrounding air is increasingly thin, and no one has offered a plan to stabilize a very unstable America.

I fought for years to design policies that would put defense savings to prudent use

once the cold war ended. I have introduced numerous economic conversion bills and last year I introduced a bill to add flexibility to the Budget Enforcement Act. Both issues are the primary topics of today's debate, because changes in the world has brought us to this point. And yet only the CBC budget truly addresses these topics in a substantive manner.

When the President officially ended the cold war during the State of the Union speech, I waited, as did most Americans, for him to launch a new era of Pax Americana. I expected new investment programs that are the natural dividends of four decades of sacrifices—deep cuts in defense, new infrastructure projects, a progressive health care and more money for education. Instead his budget proposals were as if he had forgotten the very words he had just spoken. As if the cold war had not ended; as if the social problems did not exist; as if the Federal deficit was an imaginary demon.

But how many signs does the President need before he is convinced that problems in America have reached critical mass. How many more families will be thrown out on our city streets, before we make real investments in public housing? How many more international education competitions will American children rank last, before we make concrete investments in America's educational system? How many more young people will die a violent death, before we put real investments into programs that offer economic alternatives to crime?

The President's budget provides no answers, and only proves that he is out of touch with America. It continues to speak to the status quo, and rejects the reality of our current situation. It reduces Pell grants by 400,000 instead of expanding educational opportunities; it cuts 42,000 mass transit jobs instead of supporting increases in inner city transportation; and it eliminates 1.3 million households from programs that give low-income families access to energy, instead of investing programs to help these American citizens. It continues policies that divide our country, instead of promoting policies that unite the nation.

Today, however, we have the opportunity to vote on an amendment that admits our vulnerabilities and offers an alternative that can turn this country around. The CBC budget gives the American people dividends on some of the investments made over four decades. It is a budget that is inclusive, not one that excludes. It is a proposal that places the future of this country on the shoulders of everyone, and not just those who have carried America for the past 12 years.

The CBC budget amendment creates an incremental ripple effect unseen in the history of massive defense spending. It cuts defense spending by only \$49 billion in 1993, reduces defense spending by \$400 billion over 5 years and still leaves a strong and ready military. It eliminates large and costly weapons programs and creates tens of thousands of jobs, in hundreds of different and diverse fields. It dramatically increases domestic discretionary spending and never exceeds the budget deficit targets set up in 1990.

Reducing spending on fat-cat defense contractors, it instead uses \$15 billion in defense savings to put people back to work in manu-

facturing jobs, and provides \$3 billion in defense savings for the conversion of defense industries into productive commercial enterprises.

Reducing spending on Trident subs and rail garrison missiles, it instead uses \$5 billion in savings to build better mass transit systems, and improve roads, highways, and bridges.

The CBC alternative budget takes us farther down the road of progress in 1 year, than we traveled in the last 10. It gives us the foundation to move onto the next decade, and gives us the resources to rebuild the areas where we are weak.

Contrary to critical opinion, the CBC alternative does not forsake one Government priority over another. But strikes a balance between social programs, military might and deficit reduction. It returns fairness to a tax rate lost in the 1980's, and returns Government back to the many instead of the few.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for America to do what is good for America. It is time to stop fighting the old battles and to begin to fight the new fights. And it is time that we fight those battles together. When President Kennedy said "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," he was not talking to those who made under \$75,000 a year. He meant each and every American.

I hope that we can make the right decision today and pass a budget that can give us the opportunity to succeed in a world where economic strength has far outpaced military might. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget for new world realities and for rebuilding America, the alternative offered by the Congressional Black Caucus, of which I am proud to be an associate member, and the House Progressive Caucus. I am proud to have an opportunity to take part in this long overdue restructuring of this Nation's agenda.

For far too long, our Government, in the hands of Republican administrations, has operated under a set of priorities which seem to me and many others in this body, to be incredibly misguided. We have battled year after year to sustain funding for programs that meet the fundamental needs of the citizens of this country, against administrations that put the interests of a few above the prosperity, and even survival of the many people among us who need help.

It is time for this battle to end. No longer can anyone point to the threat of communism taking over the world as a justification for unnecessary and expensive weapons systems and defense programs. No longer can anyone ignore the crime and chaos that result from the Federal Government's abandonment of our cities. We work every day in the middle of this crime and chaos, right here on Capitol Hill. It is time for everyone here to wake up and face the fact that unless we address the root cause, which is poverty, we will be unable to do anything about our problems. The reasons for diverting such an enormous amount of our resources to defense are gone, and the reasons for the firewalls in the 1990 budget agreement are gone, too.

When some of us fight to fund the programs we believe are most important, we hear a lot

about the budget deficit. I understand the importance of the Federal budget deficit. However, we have money to spend. The President's budget calls upon us to spend \$1.52 trillion. Now, we in Congress must decide whether the President's spending priorities are our own. I know they are not mine. This debate is about how best to use the resources we have to benefit this country and its people.

When we are asked to spend billions of dollars to prop up and then bail out poorly managed banks and thrifts, nobody asks us to find a way to pay for it. The administration borrows the money and adds to the debt and the deficit, and then turns around and says, well, look at our huge debt. Look at our huge deficit. We cannot afford to repair our public housing, our mass transit infrastructure, our public schools. We cannot afford to maintain the health benefits we have promised to the disabled and the elderly. We cannot afford to take care of those who are unable to feed and clothe their children, or to provide treatment to those who are struggling to overcome drug and alcohol dependency. They will have to fend for themselves, because we have other priorities.

On this day, Mr. Chairman, we must reorder the priorities that brought on the crisis of widespread homelessness, the priorities that have given our children epidemics of tuberculosis and measles, diseases which this country conquered long ago, and the priorities that have allowed a new and fatal disease, AIDS, to spread unchecked throughout our Nation. On this day, we must bring this Nation's government back to all the people.

I am here today to speak for the priorities of my people of the South Bronx. I am here to speak for the mothers who are giving birth to babies already carrying the HIV virus, for the children who sleep at night with no heat in the winter, and have no clean, lighted place to do their homework, and are threatened with irrational violence every day in their schools and around their homes. The people I speak for are Americans, and this is their Government, too. They should not have been made to pay the price for the administration's borrowing for the defense buildup. But they were the ones who paid. The end of the cold war came about because of their involuntary sacrifice of shelter, education, and health, and now we must insist that the benefits from the end of the cold war be theirs as well as the sacrifices.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues to support this budget. It is not only the fairest and most just proposal before us, but it is also the best for this country. More than any other proposal before us, this budget will help us to rebuild this Nation by mobilizing our most valuable resource, the American people.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Towns-Dellums substitute to the committee budget resolution and I urge my colleagues to cast their votes in favor of the amendment.

I commend my colleagues of the Black Caucus for their efforts. More than anything else, the Black Caucus alternative budget is about investing in our future. It is about ensuring that our quality of life will be maintained into the 21st century. It is about guaranteeing that our children will have the same opportunities we had to succeed and prosper in a global economy.

The collapse of the Soviet Union as a military threat now can allow us to rechannel our defense budget into programs that will help our economy grow and begin to make long-term investments in programs essential to future vitality.

Industrial research and development, education, helping workers employed by the defense industry to take their skills to the civilian sector, public health—investment in these areas now will make sure that we can compete in a new world order in which economic strength, not military confrontation, will win our country's battles.

A key sector in which we must invest is our transportation infrastructure.

During the last session, the Congress rewrote the Nation's transportation programs in the form of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, or ISTEA.

During the debate on that legislation, it became extremely clear that underfunding of transportation improvements around the country could mean economic suicide in the future because a new world order increasingly values the ability to compete and quality of life above all else.

Mr. Chairman, the President would have us cut vital transportation programs and endanger the future of the new course we have crafted for our Nation's infrastructure.

I believe that keeping the authorization levels as close to those in the ISTEA legislation is crucial if we are to fund programs which include highway and transit capital projects as well as motor carrier and other safety improvements, transportation research and developments, and the availability of much-needed funds for implementing Federal mandates such as the Clean Air Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act.

I would like to especially emphasize the importance of fully funding our Federal transit programs. The ISTEA carefully balances highway and transit funding in a way which will reduce urban and suburban congestion, which has doubled over the last decade, and which will reduce air pollution. Underfunding transit programs will skew this careful balance reached by the Congress and the President in the ISTEA legislation.

The Towns-Dellums amendment would add \$2 billion in grants and operating expenses for the Urban Mass Transit Administration. It would enhance railroad safety and efficiency. It would improve our air safety.

I believe that the Black Caucus budget alternative adheres to the spirit of the Transportation bill and would lead to economic growth, job creation, and better economic competitiveness. I urge my colleagues to support the Towns-Dellums amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 342, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

AYES—77

Abercrombie	Jacobs	Rahall
Alexander	Jefferson	Rangel
Atkins	Kennedy	Roybal
AuCoin	Kildee	Sabo
Blackwell	Kopetski	Sanders
Bonior	Lehman (FL)	Savage
Boxer	Lewis (GA)	Scheuer
Bruce	Markey	Schroeder
Clay	Martinez	Serrano
Collins (IL)	McDermott	Stark
Collins (MI)	Mfume	Stokes
Conyers	Miller (CA)	Studds
Coyne	Mineta	Swift
DeFazio	Mink	Thornton
Dellums	Moakley	Torres
Dixon	Nagle	Towns
Edwards (CA)	Neal (MA)	Trafficant
Espy	Oaker	Traxler
Evans	Oberstar	Unsoeld
Fascell	Olver	Vento
Flake	Owens (NY)	Washington
Foglietta	Pastor	Waters
Ford (MI)	Payne (NJ)	Weiss
Ford (TN)	Pelosi	Wheat
Frank (MA)	Perkins	Wyden
Hayes (IL)	Peterson (MN)	

NOES—342

Ackerman	Coughlin	Green
Allard	Cox (CA)	Guarini
Allen	Cox (IL)	Gunderson
Anderson	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Andrews (ME)	Crane	Hall (TX)
Andrews (NJ)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Andrews (TX)	Darden	Hammerschmidt
Anthony	Davis	Hancock
Applegate	de la Garza	Hansen
Archer	DeLauro	Harris
Armey	DeLay	Hastert
Aspin	Derrick	Hatcher
Bacchus	Dickinson	Hayes (LA)
Baker	Dicks	Hefley
Ballenger	Dingell	Hefner
Barnard	Donnelly	Henry
Bartlett	Doollittle	Herger
Barton	Dorgan (ND)	Hertel
Bateman	Dornan (CA)	Hoagland
Bellenson	Downey	Hobson
Bennett	Dreier	Hochbrueckner
Bentley	Duncan	Holloway
Bereuter	Durbin	Hopkins
Berman	Dwyer	Horn
Bevill	Early	Horton
Billbray	Eckart	Houghton
Billirakis	Edwards (OK)	Hoyer
Billie	Edwards (TX)	Hubbard
Boehlert	Emerson	Huckaby
Boehner	Engel	Hughes
Borski	English	Hunter
Boucher	Erdreich	Hutto
Brewster	Ewing	Hyde
Brooks	Fawell	Inhofe
Broomfield	Fazio	James
Browder	Feighan	Jenkins
Brown	Fields	Johnson (CT)
Bryant	Fish	Johnson (SD)
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Johnson (TX)
Burton	Frost	Johnston
Bustamante	Galligly	Jones (GA)
Byron	Gallo	Jones (NC)
Callahan	Gaydos	Jontz
Camp	Gejdenson	Kanjorski
Campbell (CA)	Gekas	Kaptur
Campbell (CO)	Gephardt	Kasich
Cardin	Geren	Kennelly
Carper	Gibbons	Klecza
Carr	Gilchrest	Klug
Chapman	Gillmor	Kolbe
Clement	Gilman	Kolter
Clinger	Gingrich	Kostmayer
Coble	Glickman	Kyl
Coleman (MO)	Gonzalez	LaFalce
Coleman (TX)	Goodling	Lagomarsino
Combest	Gordon	Lancaster
Condit	Goss	Lantos
Cooper	Gradison	LaRocco
Costello	Grandy	Laughlin

Leach	Orton	Sikorski
Lehman (CA)	Oxley	Sisk
Lent	Packard	Skaggs
Levin (MI)	Pallone	Skeen
Levine (CA)	Panetta	Skelton
Lewis (CA)	Parker	Slattery
Lewis (FL)	Patterson	Slaughter
Lightfoot	Paxon	Smith (FL)
Lloyd	Payne (VA)	Smith (IA)
Long	Pease	Smith (NJ)
Lowery (CA)	Penny	Smith (OR)
Lowey (NY)	Peterson (FL)	Smith (TX)
Luken	Petri	Snowe
Machley	Pickett	Solarz
Manton	Pickle	Solomon
Marlenee	Porter	Spence
Martin	Poshard	Spratt
Matsui	Price	Staggers
Mavroules	Pursell	Stallings
Mazoli	Ramstad	Stearns
McCandless	Ravenel	Stenholm
McCloskey	Ray	Stump
McCollum	Reed	Swett
McCrery	Regula	Synar
McCurdy	Rhodes	Tallon
McDade	Richardson	Tanner
McEwen	Ridge	Tauzin
McGrath	Riggs	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Rinaldo	Taylor (NC)
McMillan (NC)	Ritter	Thomas (CA)
McMillen (MD)	Roberts	Thomas (GA)
McNulty	Roe	Thomas (WY)
Meyers	Roemer	Torricelli
Michel	Rogers	Upton
Miller (OH)	Rohrabacher	Valentine
Miller (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Vander Jagt
Mollinari	Rose	Visclosky
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Volkmer
Montgomery	Roth	Vucanovich
Moody	Roukema	Walker
Moorhead	Rowland	Walsh
Moran	Sangmeister	Waxman
Morella	Santorum	Weber
Morrison	Sarpallus	Weldon
Mrazek	Sawyer	Williams
Murphy	Saxton	Wilson
Murtha	Schaefer	Wise
Myers	Schiff	Wolf
Natcher	Schulze	Wolpe
Neal (NC)	Schumer	Wylie
Nichols	Sensenbrenner	Yatron
Nowak	Sharp	Young (AK)
Nussle	Shaw	Young (FL)
Obey	Shays	Zeliff
Olin	Shuster	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Annunzio	Ireland	Quillen
Chandler	Lipinski	Russo
Dannemeyer	Livingston	Sundquist
Dooley	Ortiz	Whitten
Dymally	Owens (UT)	Yates

□ 1753

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Ortiz against.

Mr. BENNETT and Mr. OXLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). It is now in order to return to the additional period of general debate on House Concurrent Resolution 287.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I will take this time to advise the Members

that it is not the intent of the majority to try to use all of our time. Our hope is to try to arrive at a vote on the resolution by a quarter to 7. There is no motion to recommit allowed under the rule, so we could proceed immediately to a vote the resolution itself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just take a moment of the Committee of the Whole here to talk about an important part of this budget resolution which we have before us, which is the defense number. There have been a number of comments in the last 2 days by Members who have claimed that the only way we can make further cuts in the defense budget, further cuts below where the President is, is by making cuts that none of us in this room want to make. We are talking about making cuts in personnel below where the President is cutting. There have been numbers tossed about about how we may have to cut another 300,000 active duty personnel next year.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record at this point in stating that the people have greatly underestimated the ability of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations to find responsible reductions in a \$281 billion budget.

There are places to find a cut of \$7 billion in budget authority and \$5 billion in outlays in a \$282 billion cut without cutting the kinds of things that people have been talking about and the kinds of things we are worried about here.

The Committee on Armed Services, if directed by the House through the budget resolution, can and will make responsible, smart cuts in the President's defense request for the year 1993. A prescription for drawing our forces down smartly would include the following elements, and these will include the following elements of the Committee on Armed Services that will come to the floor following this budget resolution if the House approves this budget resolution.

First of all, we will protect military personnel. There will be no cuts in that budget below the numbers that the President has already prescribed for 1993.

□ 1800

Second, we will protect the readiness, which is very very important to make sure we do not have a hollow army.

There are two other things that we will protect. We will protect key defense industries and we will protect defense technologies. Those are the outlines of the kinds of things that we will be protecting when we move the President's budget cuts from minus \$7 billion in budget authority to minus \$15 billion.

Let me tell Members some of the things we will be looking at to cut. We

will first of all look at overseas spending and burden sharing. That is one primary area that we will look for cuts. Second, we will look at overhead, and the third item that we will look at is excess stocks. I think a number of Members in the House have already noted the "60 Minutes" program which called attention to the excess stocks and the problems that we have with them.

Mr. Chairman, just to wrap up, I hope the Members will remember this debate when we bring the authorization to the floor sometime later this spring, because all of the comments about the gloom and doom that will accompany this budget resolution will be proven wrong when the authorization bill comes to the floor in April or May.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I can see very little merit in this resolution package. It forces the Federal Government to spend a billion dollars a day more than it takes in, which is objectionable enough. But, it could also double the huge cuts in defense that the President already calls for.

I am very concerned over the depth of the defense cuts already proposed by our President and the impact on our defense posture, military personnel, workers in the defense industry, and our economy. Accelerating these cuts in the face of continuing and unforeseeable threats to our national security would be irresponsible.

As ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I must point out to my colleagues that the package does not support veterans.

The most deserving, appropriate group to benefit from a peace dividend has been reduced to an afterthought in this budget resolution. Let me be very clear on this point: This measure is far from generous to veterans. In plan A—the peace dividend plan—the \$400 billion deficit plan—veterans who fought the wars and secured the peace receive an embarrassing 2 percent of the peace dividend.

There are, unfortunately, Members of this body who will use veterans issues to promote their own social agenda, but when we need them to support veterans programs with adequate funding, they are nowhere to be seen. They spend their so-called peace dividend on every program under the sun—and then throw crumbs to our Nation's war veterans.

Let us discuss health care: This Nation made a commitment to meet the health needs of veterans. However, the administration's fiscal year 1993 budget is approximately \$300 million short of current services, though services have already been cut back considerably. Such shortfall does not take into account the near billion dollar backlog in procurement of new and replacement medical equipment, salary increases for essential medical personnel, and unanticipated and unprecedented cost in-

creases of pharmaceutical products. Veterans health care programs received \$100 million of the total \$15 billion peace dividend plan—or less than 1 percent.

Let us discuss those who were disabled while fighting for the peace dividend: Inadequate staffing levels have played a major role in the declines in both the quality and timeliness of benefits claims processing. At VA regional offices in fiscal year 1991, only 23.6 percent of original compensation claims were being processed within 90 days. Mr. Chairman, veterans are not getting their benefits in a timely manner because there aren't enough people to process them. Compensation programs for service disabled veterans do not benefit from the peace dividend plan, but there is a \$125 million peace dividend to administer Medicare and a \$131 million peace dividend to administer Social Security.

Let's discuss education: in interview after interview during the Persian Gulf war, young soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines cited the opportunity to earn education benefits, and learning a skill while serving their country, as their primary reasons for enlisting in the military. Our remarkable success during desert storm demonstrated conclusively that the All-Volunteer Force is made up of the men and women the Armed Forces need—the best and the brightest—and a principal reason these individuals chose to enter the armed services was to earn education benefits. We promised our military personnel that, in exchange for honorable service, we would provide them the means to go to school, to further their education, and to increase their individual productivity. Neither the current nor the previous administration budgeted for an increase in GI bill benefits since 1984, but education benefits for those who never served will increase \$2 billion, courtesy of the peace dividend plan.

And let us discuss the homeless: studies indicate that at least one-third of America's homeless are veterans, however VA is appropriated only one-twentieth of McKinney Homeless Act funds. For many of these veterans, psychiatric and medical problems exacerbate circumstances which have led to their living on the streets. The administration's Fiscal Year 1993 VA Budget for homeless programs is \$34.5 million, which is less than 1 percent of the CBO freeze estimate for housing and homeless programs. Veterans homeless programs do not benefit from the peace dividend plan, but housing and homeless programs receive over 10 percent of the peace dividend plan.

One year ago, Members of this body made speech after speech in support of veterans, especially those who served in the Persian Gulf. Some were nothing more than varnished apologies for forgetting the veterans of the Vietnam war. They promised that veterans would not be forgotten again.

So let's review how this proposal spends the peace dividend and once again forgets the veterans: only \$100 million for veterans' healthcare, compared to \$188 million for the National Science Foundation, \$200 million for NASA, \$439 million for mass transit, and \$352 million to the IRS—I guess even the Federal Government pays a tax.

VA medical research receives \$20 million from the peace dividend plan, but \$300 million

is budgeted for NIH research programs and another \$300 million is specifically identified for AIDS research. Or compare the \$20 million for VA medical research to the \$21 million for Amtrak, the \$25 million for the National Health Service Corps, or the \$22 million payment to the District of Columbia government.

Were the promises of support for veterans made a year ago truly empty or does this body feel that veterans deserve better?

I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure. The whole country will fare better if the Congress demonstrates seriousness about reducing the deficit. But if we compulsively must spend a "peace dividend," then spend it on those who won it for us—our Nation's veterans.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the majority is presenting one budget that has two options, plans A and B. Some prefer to call this the Chinese restaurant school of budgetmaking: One from column A, two from column B.

Whatever it is called, the Democrats will not even allow a vote for either plans A or B.

Plan A, the one with mushy pork, assumes that the budget discipline that established three spending categories for defense, international and domestic programs be abandoned in 1993.

Under plan A, anticipated defense savings below the cap would go to increase other spending and not to reduce the deficit.

But the bill required to change the law on these spending caps has not even been scheduled for a vote until next week, if then. And if it passes, it is definitely going to be vetoed.

So this is not even a case of putting the cart before the horse. This is a case of buying the cart when you are not going to have a horse to pull it.

Then we have plan B, the one with egg drop soup. It assumes that the budget discipline will be maintained.

Both plans A and B of the Democratic budget agree on one point: Deep defense cuts in the first year, double the additional defense cuts proposed by the President.

If we look behind the glossy rhetoric about all the goodies that can be had with larger defense cuts, we will find this ugly little fact. That is that we will have, if the Democrats' defense budget becomes a reality, an extra 300,000 active duty military personnel who would have to be cut from the rolls in 1993 over and above the 236,000 that the President has already decided on. If we look at the current figures, we are probably reducing our Armed Forces by about 15,000 a month, and if we look at the unemployment rolls around the country and how much they are going up, it may be just practically

a direct offset. It means real pain to real people. But I would also suggest, even more important, the Democrat's plan destroys the Secretary of Defense's efforts to orchestrate an orderly build-down of our defenses as he has so well laid it out for us time and time again in committee meetings, and yes, in ad hoc meetings with Members on both sides of the aisle.

Another little fact Members should know about this budget is that it ignores the Democratic tax bill that we passed just last week. Last week we were told in the House that the tax bill that the Democrats narrowly passed was a defining vote for their party. But the numbers in this Democratic budget do not even reflect the policies of that tax bill.

That will give Members some idea of how serious the Democrats are around here about economic policy.

What does this Democratic budget tell us, you might ask? It clearly tells us the Democrats in the House cannot make really tough choices. They cannot say no to anyone except the Commander in Chief and the men and women of our Armed Forces who will be the first victims of this Democratic budget.

The Democratic Party has not given this country a popular leader since 1960 and has not had a new idea since 1932. This incapacity for leadership is reflected in their budget.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the best way to describe the Democratic budget is to take a page from history.

When Catherine the Great made her grand progress through Russia, she was delighted to see clean and tidy villages. And what she did not know was that those villages, frankly, were mere facades hastily erected by her adviser, Potemkin, to disguise atrocious conditions. And ever since then, any facade or show designed to hide an undesirable fact or condition has been known as a Potemkin village.

The Democratic budget is a Potemkin village with a vengeance. I would urge my colleagues to tear down this facade and vote against the Democratic budget, plan A or B and plan X, if they have that one ready to go before this debate is over.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this budget resolution but I still think the defense reductions are too severe.

Over the years, I have heard Members rant and rave on the floor of the House about too many defense budget cuts, and that we are not putting enough money in defense. We have cut in the last 10 years over \$150 billion out of the defense budget. Members got up on the floor and complained vigorously about that reduction. We feel these cuts were justified and were selective for the best results.

Usually the budget resolution as it went over from the House usually cut too much from defense, and we were quite concerned about it.

If this were the final budget resolution, I would not vote for it because I feel there is too much of a cut for defense. But I know it will be rectified. I know that before the thing is in its final version, we will have more money in the budget itself.

Let me tell the Members the pain that the troops are going through. What we have tried to do over the years was fashion a budget that sets priorities so that our Armed Forces take care of the people. The people are really the key in the budget that we fashion. We want good people and we want them to be well trained.

Take the 24th Division that fought in Korea. They were poorly trained and poorly equipped. They lost thousands of people in Korea in the beginning days. Conversely, in Saudi Arabia, the 24th Division, in combat in 100 hours lost less than 50 people because they were well trained, well equipped, and had high morale.

Right now those same troops that served in Desert Storm are being sent back home, after being deployed from Europe they are now being sent back home. We are transferring people so fast from Europe right now that they have to leave their household goods for somebody else to pack up. We cannot return people from Europe any faster and we cannot put people out in the economy any faster than we are doing now.

There is some money that we can cut from defense. Personnel is not the place to get those cuts. Readiness is not the place to get those cuts. We have to guard against excessive cuts, and we have just voted down what I consider an excessive cut in defense levels.

I think we can find reductions to maintain a smaller, well trained force, with the transportation necessary to get that force overseas, and with the support people we need. We need the C-17's and the sealift capability to get those people overseas.

□ 1810

I recently talked to a commander who told me that the troops that were transferred to Saudi Arabia from Europe, then back to Europe were then transferred to the United States and did not even have housing. They had to take the children out of the schools before the school year was completed and send them back to the United States. The troops and their families are housed in temporary quarters and will have to be transferred to permanent housing in the future.

There is no way that we can accept the type of cuts that have been recommended. Usually every budget resolution that has gone from the House

side has had too little money for defense. In the end, we have come up with what I felt was the right amount of money. I expect this to be the case now.

One of the proudest days I had this year was walking down the street ahead of the troops from the Desert Storm operation as the honorary grand marshal in the parade in Pittsburgh attended by 250,000 people. Even with over \$150 billion worth of cuts over the past 10 years, we had a force that was adequate, a force that was ready, a force that was well equipped, and a force that did a phenomenal job. I was proud of our troops.

Congress seldom gets credit.

So I am convinced that even though this resolution is inadequate, even though there is not enough money for defense in this budget resolution as it leaves the House, I am willing to vote for it, because I know it will be increased.

I urge the Members to move the process forward. We need to move the budget resolution forward and get it settled as quickly as possible. Then the Committee on Armed Services can act and the Defense Appropriations Committee can finally pass the funding legislation that takes care of the people in the armed services and the equipment that is necessary to prevent a war.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], my dear friend and admired colleague, just had to say. I agree with a lot of what he had to say, and a few things I do not agree with, and some things that my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], had to say.

Secretary Cheney, I think has studied this thing rather well. Notwithstanding the protestations of others to the contrary, you are going to understand, my colleagues, what it means when we fire another 300,000 volunteers that we are ultimately going to need from our armed services over the next 18 months.

They are going to be calling your offices as well as mine. There is no way to come down as quickly as this budget resolution calls for without digging deeply and viciously into the personnel account as well as the O&M account.

People say down the line, "Call us back and see how we are doing." Right now, you are writing the end of the career of a lot of people that we are going to need, a lot of people who have served us well.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution.

The Democratic budget is a fiscally sound, disciplined plan. It reduces spending wherever possible, it does not violate the budget agreement, and it attacks the deficit—at least 25 percent of any defense savings will go toward deficit reduction.

Our budget takes our financial limitations into consideration, and then shifts our priorities so that we can focus on our current needs. It reflects the changes taking place both in America and throughout the world.

Our defense spending is \$4.2 billion less than the President wants it to be. But it is based on the House Armed Services Committee's updated defense strategy, and addresses our military challenges in this new international environment. Our budget then takes these savings and applies a portion of them to attacking the deficit. It also allows us to reinvest defense savings in economic conversion—including job training for displaced military personnel and defense workers. And the budget includes a 5-percent decrease in funding for both Congress and the President's office.

However, our budget does not sacrifice our critical domestic programs in order to achieve these ends. Unlike the President, we cannot ask our most vulnerable citizens—the unemployed, the underinsured, our senior citizens and retirees, our veterans, our children—to bear the brunt of this burden. Too many Americans are hurting for us to expect them to pay our way out of this financial hole.

What the Democratic budget does is reorder our priorities and, in areas where the President cut critical funding, we either restore or increase it. This includes protecting important programs in health care, job training, housing, nutrition, mass transit, and energy assistance. Our budget rejects all of the President's proposed cuts for Medicare, Federal employees, and veterans.

We put our money into preventive measures that will save us money down the road—medical research, health care, energy conservation, small business financing. Our budget enables us to invest in our important resources—our people, our communities, our infrastructure—and, at the same time, begin to wrestle with this overwhelming deficit.

Chairman PANETTA and the members and staff of the House Budget Committee are to be commended for their outstanding efforts in putting this strategy together. It proves that we can tighten our belts and meet our present, critical needs while we plan for and invest in our future.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the Committee on the Budget.

I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution offered by the Democrats on the House Budget Committee and its distinguished chairman, LEON PANETTA.

What we have with this resolution is our Nation's first real peace dividend. As we all

know, the world, along with our Nation's security needs, has changed dramatically in the past few years. In response to this change, our armed services chairman has identified \$15 billion in further defense cuts which does not hurt our national security posture one iota, nor does it cause undue hardship on our already beleaguered military industrial base.

The Budget Committee has crafted this \$15 billion into a thoughtful package of priorities which few people—on either side of the aisle—can argue with. It allocates much-needed extra funding into such areas as Head Start and Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education. In health care \$400 million is added to the Women, Infants and Children Program; AIDS and veterans' health care receive a much-needed boost; and \$150 million is allocated to fully fund our Nation's childhood immunization program—probably the most cost-effective health program we have in America. Finally, this budget resolution allocates more money to infrastructure repair, mass transit, job training, and housing.

This resolution maintains some of the basic tenets of budget discipline in that it conforms to spending limits of the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act; it reduces the deficit with a portion of the defense reductions; gimmicks—such as accrual accounting—are not used to pay for spending increases or tax cuts; and we don't give the shaft to Medicare, veterans, or our civil servants.

For those of us in this body who want to stick to the original Budget Act and devote all of our savings to deficit reduction, I offer a few points. First, when this agreement was signed, there was nobody who could have predicted that 18 months later our Nation would be in the dire straits that it is in right now in the areas of health care, education, and employment. While \$2 billion of this agreement will go toward deficit reduction, \$13 billion will go to those sectors of our population that missed out on the largess of the 1980's.

Second, voting for this resolution doesn't mean going back on a promise, but realigning our national priorities. Polls show that when offered a peace dividend, the American public doesn't want an insignificant tax cut or meager payment on the debt. Rather, they want to direct it to those sectors of our society that desperately need the help. This resolution does just that. When I ran for office, I didn't offer my position on every vote or issue I would take, and neither did any of my colleagues. I did promise that I would represent the needs and concerns of my constituents. By voting for this resolution I will represent the greatest need of my constituents; and the Members of this body can do the same.

Would I like to have \$100 billion to allocate to reducing the budget deficit, you bet. But we don't have \$100 billion, we have \$15 billion and it is time that we reprioritize the needs of our Nation and take some of this peace dividend and direct it to where the American people want it to go. If we allocated all this \$15 billion to debt reduction, it would symbolize a pay down of three-tenths of 1 percent on the total debt or provide interest payments for 18 days. Such a limited amount can surely give us more bang for our buck when directed to other priority needs.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time that we address some of the most pressing needs of our

Nation. We need help—right now—in childhood immunizations, AIDS research, and infrastructure repair. This resolution will help us do just that.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I support the budget resolution before us.

I would like to underscore two points I made yesterday. The first is the relatively small difference between what the President wants to spend on defense and what this budget resolution would allow.

The second point is my own firm conviction that we can make these added cuts without trimming personnel any more than the President himself has proposed.

When it comes to defense, here is what this debate is about: it is about taking \$6.6 billion off the President's mark for BA, and then in turn taking \$4.2 billion off his mark for outlays. In percentage terms, what the Committee on the Budget is talking about is a 2.3-percent cut in budget authority, that is all, 2.3 percent, and in outlays, the cut is even less. In the outlays, the cut off the President's mark would be 1.4 percent.

Now, surely, surely, we are not going to take the President's budget of \$291 billion uncritically and say, "This much and no more," and not even give it a good scrub.

I assure you, if we scrub this budget, we can find 2.3 percent of it that does not need to be spent next year.

These numbers in function 050 for defense are not plugs. They were not pulled out of thin air by the Committee on the Budget. They were given to us, recommended to us, by the chairman of the Committee of Armed Services himself. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] did not give these budget numbers for fiscal year 1993 to us without first doing a full scrub of the budget himself and deciding whether or not, as he just told us, we could do this, we could take these cuts, without digging further into personnel or damaging readiness, two of the areas that we want to protect and that we are going to protect.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has just told us that he is convinced himself that we can cut defense spending next year by \$4.2 billion and still protect personnel and still protect readiness.

Let me give you a few examples of how we can do it. The fiscal year 1993 request for O&M, operations and maintenance, is \$84.5 billion. That is a lot of money by anybody's reckoning. Out of this amount of money, the services buy spares and replacement parts and inventory. In January of this year, the General Accounting Office told us in a report that over the last decade the Department of Defense had accumulated an enormous inventory worldwide in

depots and warehouses everywhere worth at cost \$250 billion, up \$150 billion over the last 10 years. That is inventory on hand.

Based on its study, the GAO told us that we can cut inventory for secondary small items by at least \$5 billion next year, fiscal year 1992, and not even know the difference.

This one proposal alone would cover most of our BA reduction and most of our outlay reduction.

Mr. Chairman, clearly in a budget of \$291 billion, saving 2.3 percent is not an impossible goal. We can do it, and we should do it, by passing this budget resolution.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against the Budget Committee's resolution for a number of reasons. I will briefly mention one.

Now I understand what building defense from the bottom up means—gut it to fit the world of the illusionists, who think it is safer to skimp on defense, then gamble we can fight and win the next war.

Gamble by shelving weapons technology and idling the defense industrial base. Even worse, gamble at tossing hundreds of thousands of stunned service men and women into a wobbly economy.

We can, and should, reduce the defense budget, but not with cuts of this magnitude. It bankrupts the Nation's defense, and does more harm to an already weak economy.

This proposal doubles the President's proposed cuts. His plan is better, but also cuts too deep. At least, it uses defense savings to reduce a budget deficit swollen by years of Federal spending sprees.

Every service chief says that cutting our fighting forces too fast will not enable us to fight and win a future two-front war. We should listen to them, rather than turning over this country's survival to bean counters who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

It is people in uniform who count most in this debate. Their ranks are being thinned too fast. We have to find better ways to gradually reduce the world's finest fighting force. And we can do it for a lot less than the millions in aid sent to Russia, and the billions we give others in foreign aid.

For almost 50 years, we kept our Armed Forces strong, averting a world war. Why rush to stop doing the very thing that produces peace?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to rise in support of the bill, and I want to thank the chairman, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], and I understand the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for putting in the report a very important statement.

I would just want to reiterate to my colleagues that it says that the committee assumes an increase of \$500 million for the purpose of making up the deficit in women's health research, and then you nail all of these terrible diseases that have not been fully explored in terms of finding a cure and arresting those diseases. I want to thank the chairman and thank all of you for doing that. That is a real important statement.

□ 1820

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I want to make an observation today, if I may. I have listened as intently as everybody else has around here during this past day and yesterday. We listened to the eloquent speeches made by everybody on both sides of the aisle, in my judgment. The fact of the matter is I think it is one of the finest debates that I have heard in my 22 years here in the House.

There was something that came through here that I would like to share with you all. I think what came through was the interest and the sincerity of purpose and the deep concern of each individual Member. Many spoke of frustrations and irritations in the different areas they saw the direction to go, but let me share something with you which I think is terribly important.

Last year we worked the entire year and used 57 members of the Committee on Public Works, plus 100 Members of staffs of all committees, to write a Transportation bill.

Now, by God, you voted 372 Members of this House to 47 in favor of the Intermodal Transportation bill. The only bill you have before you where there are real jobs is the Transportation bill. Each and every one of you in each one of your districts in each State is based upon real jobs, 2 million jobs.

Now, in candor, let us look at the facts. We have before us in the budget we are considering now the committee level or Congress's level for transportation for the highway transportation part of the bill. They are jobs in your districts. All of the tax discussions and the nonsense that we have been talking about does not create one new job. The only bill you have is that bill.

Therefore, if you are going to carry that bill out, you have got to fund the bill. That is what this issue is about.

Now, I am going to speak well about the Budget chairman and the Budget

Committee, because they restored back the full amount of money that you voted for, three-quarters or 80 percent of this House, in passing that Transportation bill. They have provided the resources for it in this budget area.

I must take a little bit of umbrage, however, because the Budget Committee did not include the full level they should have included in the transit part of the bill. The transit part of the bill is critically important. It is a billion dollars short, and even though it is a billion dollars short, I intend to vote for this Budget resolution because what we have now is the only jobs bill in the Congress of the United States.

You have spoken about tax bills. You have spoken about the points of view, that those tax bills did not create real jobs, and again what we are talking about is putting people back to work in this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman gives me one more minute, and I will try to conclude on that basis. Forgive me if I am being a little bit testy.

You also voted 2½ cents and you extended the gas tax to provide the real money to do this particular transportation bill.

So I would hope when you evaluate in your minds, set aside the partisan politics. My father taught me something, that half of nothing is nothing.

The only thing, looking at every face in this room, that you can take back to your districts and your respective States now is funding the transportation bill. It is the only true jobs bill we have. Those are the real jobs.

The committee is working on other legislation now, an accelerated Public Works bill which in a month's time we will bring before this body for its consideration, but let me close on this point.

When all is said and done, people cannot pay taxes, you cannot increase the wealth of this country, you cannot provide the resources you are talking about, unless you create the new wealth. For every dollar we spend in capital construction and infrastructure, we create \$10 in increase in our economic capacity and capability of this Nation.

So I would hope that you would set aside the arguments. Vote for one thing for sure, that is this budget resolution, and vote for the jobs that this country needs.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish in all sincerity that I could support my friend and colleague, the chairman of

the Committee on the Budget, and the budget that is before us. I cannot do this.

I spent a great deal of time, Mr. Chairman, working on what we should have as a national defense. I followed the suggestion of our outstanding chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] on my own, with a great deal of help from staff, military and civilian experts that I built up on what we need in the way of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this budget would start us on a slippery slope of returning to where we were in those sad days of unpreparedness between the First World War and the Second, the time of Korea in 1950 and to the days when those of us who are serving here found ourselves with a hollow military. We cannot do that.

This is an historic opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for us, the Members of Congress, to reverse the historical trend, to do something about staying militarily strong; cut where we can. We have already cut the military budget 25 percent over 5 years and cutting an additional \$50 billion in addition thereto. Without that, we cannot proceed if we cut that any further.

I might add that with the budget proposal agreement suggested by the Secretary of Defense, we have already cut 32 percent of the Active Duty Army.

Yes, there will be armories closed. Yes, there will be Reserve units shut down. Yes, you will send the brave sergeant who did a good job in Kuwait and Iraq back home with a pink slip; but more important than that, you will set a trend for us in the days and years ahead that could prove dangerous in this kaleidoscope of history, the future of which is never predictable. We did not predict Pearl Harbor. We did not predict North Korea coming into the South. We did not predict Saddam Hussein going into Kuwait.

Let us cut with ration and reason. Let us do it wisely. Let us not do it precipitously.

For my friend who said that he would vote for this, but would not vote for it if it were the final budget, I say that I for one, Mr. Chairman, regretfully cannot vote for it.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the close of this debate. I want to thank the Members who participated and also thank the Members for their patience during this debate. It is a debate about the budget of the United States.

As I have said often, our budget is not just an issue dealing with numbers. It is an issue dealing with people and with the priorities of this country.

It is also an issue dealing with the business of the Nation and our responsibility to produce a budget so that we can continue the business of the Nation.

□ 1830

There are Members here, as I have said, who would not vote for any budget resolution, A, B, C, D, E, or F. They are prepared to vote against any resolution; they are prepared to talk about the problem of the deficit, they are prepared to talk about the problems that confront our country, but they are not prepared to make tough choices.

The President's budget is brought to the floor, and 119 Representatives walk away from it; only 42 votes up on the board for the President's budget. And yet the arguments here are, "Oh, the President's numbers are fine on defense, we want to stick with the President's numbers on defense." They do not even support the President's budget.

So there are Members here who are not going to vote for any budget, and I do not address my remarks to those Members because the American people want leadership here, not people who run and hide in the trenches.

The issue here is the budget that confronts this country and the priorities that we need to confront and the choices that need to be made. This is the earliest that a budget resolution has been brought to the floor.

Yes, we have faced uncertainties here. I do not know what is going to happen on the Conyers bills or the walls legislation, but that is coming to a vote next week.

My responsibility as chairman of the Committee on the Budget and the members of that committee is not to present a budget here that is suddenly going to become irrelevant; it has got to be a budget that we can rely on. That is why we presented the paths that are presented here; both, both clearly distinguish themselves from the President's budget and both adhere to budget discipline, both are within the spending ceilings that were provided by the budget and, indeed, we reduce the deficit below the President's numbers and get rid of that accounting gimmick that was part of the President's budget.

This resolution also is fair. We do not include cuts on Medicare or on veterans or on civil servants or on other areas like mass transit as the President included. And most importantly, we make an investment. I have heard the arguments about defense. What is here is \$287 billion for defense spending. Is there anybody here who is going to tell me that is not enough? We averaged \$263 billion during the cold war years. Please, do not use the arguments of fear, the arguments of panic. We have heard those before.

I remember "Cap" Weinberger saying, "Oh, you can't cut anything or you are going to lose the Marine Corps."

Please, now is the time for some rational numbers and for some careful timing, and that is why we chose the numbers selected by the chairman of

the Committee on Armed Services. There are no personnel cuts involved with that number.

And, my God, we have already increased the area of maintenance and readiness with warehouses, to the tune of \$260 billion. You cannot get \$5 billion out of that area? Certainly we can. And that does not cut into the bone of our defense system.

The time has come to make that evaluation. And the time has come to put some resources into education, into health care and into investments on infrastructure within our society.

Mr. Chairman, we have a changed world; this is a new era. The American people are angry because they look at us and we act as if there is no change out there, as if suddenly we are stuck in the status quo.

Please, exercise some leadership here, provide some new direction.

This budget gives us the chance to do that. Vote for it, vote for it because it is in the interest of the people, vote for it because it is in the interest of doing the business of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the pending budget proposal for its deep cuts in our national defense.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my friend from California: First of all, if you give us a bill that will decrease taxes, if you give us a bill that will decrease spending and reduce military with economic conversion time and also one that balances the future threat, then, yes, we will vote for it.

I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], I would like to say that the gentleman says this is a jobs bill. How does the gentleman plan on cutting 300,000 military jobs and call that a jobs bill? When we are already cutting 236,000 jobs.

You are going to come back and ask for the President to give you more money for unemployment for a million people and you will increase the deficit with more than \$7.5 billion, like you did in the past one.

Mr. Chairman, what we need is a bill. I did not support the President's bill because neither side of the aisle would get together and come up with a rational bill that decreased taxes and decreased spending. This one does not, and I am not going to support it.

Let the same people that ran Desert Storm make the determination of what they need, not the bean counters.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in more than 30 years in public office, I have learned how to count votes. My side is going to lose this vote. I can accept this, but I want to say that what saddens me tonight is to see the budget process sink to the level it has.

I do not blame the Democrats, at least not entirely. The Budget Committee in the House of Representatives has evolved to become an important instrument of the respective leaderships, and that is true on both sides of the aisle. This is perfectly appropriate, institutionally, although I am convinced we could do a better job for the country by at least trying to develop a bipartisan budget.

Since its inception in 1974, the congressional budget process has had its ups and downs. My analysis is that the "ups" were when times were good, budgetwise, and that the "downs" were when things got tough, budgetwise. When we had the perverse benefits of high inflation in the late seventies, revenues literally tumbled in, and when these revenue longfalls were combined with unexplainable spending shortfalls, mostly in defense, the deficit seemed smaller. This, in turn, made passing real budget resolutions relatively easy.

Back then, we could also have it both ways. The Democratic majority could cash in on these positive events even though they disguised a disastrous economic policy. In short, budgeting was anything but painful.

Today, we can still have it both ways. Now, times are tougher, and budgeting is hard, but there is no risk to the process because necessity is the mother of invention. And this is a highly inventive budget if nothing else.

Yet, budgeting ought to be tough because budgeting, by definition, means choosing how to allocate scarce resources among competing demands. Unfortunately, the tricks we keep coming up with in order to pretend this isn't so are actually a testament of our lack of political will to face the task.

And let me be clear—there is little that is scientific or even objective about budgeting. Budgeting has always been primarily political and it always will be. This is as it should be.

What bothers me—a lot—is the form the politics of budgeting has taken. This is not a partisan statement. I have listened with great care to the debate and, at bottom, both sides are accusing the other of gimmickery—of having it both ways—in short, of an unwillingness to make tough decisions. And, you know, both sides may be right.

What goes around comes around. This so-called budget resolution allows Democrats to have it both ways in every respect. For example, this two-

headed hydra allows them to avoid choosing between more or less defense spending, between more or less domestic spending, and between more or less entitlement spending. They can even avoid choosing between conflicting overall budgets.

We all know that this is not what budgeting is supposed to be. This is not budgeting—this is simply a disingenuous attempt to be all things to all people. If it works, it will be to the detriment of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I can count votes. So, I congratulate my colleagues for their cleverness, and I acknowledge that all of us—indeed that this institution itself—share in the blame.

□ 1840

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker remaining. Has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] yielded back his time?

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding time to me, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and support the work that he has done on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, for the 38th straight year, a Democrat-led House of Representatives is offering budget alternatives to run the Government of the United States. You would think after 37 years of practice, they would get it right. Obviously, they haven't. In fact, they may be on the verge of establishing a record for the longest and least productive learning curve in history.

Admittedly, putting together a trillion dollar budget is complicated. But it's not the failure to grasp the complex problems that bothers me. What concerns me is that the Democrats don't appear to have learned even the most basic things about our country's needs. Mr. Chairman, they just don't get it.

All of their budget proposals follow the same old pattern—whatever you do, increase revenue; that is, increase taxes; then reduce defense—not reduce the deficit, reduce defense; and finally, spend more, spend more on favorite social programs.

Mr. Chairman, they just don't get it. One of the basics that is of particular concern to me and my district is the need for a strong defense. Several times in this century we have had the opportunity to reduce our defense expenditures—but every time we have gone overboard, and every time we have paid a price. You would think after seeing the results of this excess time and time again that the Democrats would have learned a lesson.

Mr. Chairman, they just don't get it. The President has submitted a plan for a well-organized, prudent downsizing of our armed services. It will reduce spending on defense by \$50 billion over the next 5 years. But even that isn't enough for the Democrats. For fiscal

year 1993, they are recommending more than twice the cuts that the President recommends. Then instead of using those added cuts to reduce the deficit, no, Mr. Chairman, one more time they attack defense to use the money for more social spending—not to reduce the deficit. Mr. Chairman, they just don't get it.

The Democrats say they want to help the working men and women of this country. Let them come to my district in southern California and tell the marines of 29 Palms, the airmen and women of George Air Force Base, and the soldiers of Fort Irwin why their jobs aren't important.

Let them come to Barstow, CA, and tell the working family who owns the small corner grocery store or restaurant why their customers aren't coming in anymore.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrats say they are the workingman's friend. The problem is, they just don't seem to understand that to be a working man or woman, you have to have a job. Jobs, are created not by more social spending, but by incentives to save and invest in business instead. Jobs are created by reducing the deficit, not by more taxes and more spending.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrats, who have run Congress for almost all of the last 50 years, just don't get it.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], to conclude the debate.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, we debate this budget at a time when the economic policy of this country literally seems to be floundering before us.

Last night the President's budget was voted down by over 100 Members of his own party. Only one out of five Americans now believe we are moving in the right direction.

The prosperity that we grew up with under Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon has disappeared over the last 20 years, and it has been replaced by a growing inequality between the people that are the richest 1 percent in this country, leaving the middle class and the poor more embattled, more impoverished and more dissatisfied.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, there are enormous changes going on in this world today—economic and political transformations that are shaking this country to its core.

At this time of startling change, the comfortable, the easy and the secure thing is for us to do nothing, to shirk our responsibility, and to accommodate ourselves to the status quo.

The easy thing would be for us to tinker at the margin, deny the upheaval, and make no controversial moves.

If there is a lesson to be learned in this unique year, it is that these choices aren't available to us any more.

A few days ago the President seemed to repudiate the budget summit agreement that we reached in 1990. I think that was the wrong thing to do. I think we need to say to the American people, "We made some hard decisions then, and we'll stick with them." But I also think we have to say to the American people that the world has changed and we have to be willing to change.

And so, this budget—so skillfully crafted by Chairman PANETTA and the Budget Committee—asks us to make a historic departure. It argues for new priorities and new directions.

Our budget acknowledges the end of the cold war and the persistence of regional threats. It builds a strong defense from the ground up. And it takes funds allocated to battles that will no longer be fought, and invests them in the material strength of the United States of America—so that we will be able to fight the economic battles of the post cold war world.

Our budget frees up about \$100 billion over the next 5 years, and we propose using that money to reduce the deficit and strengthen our country.

Our budget provides \$1 billion to help defense workers and defense companies, and communities like mine to manage the transition from the cold war to the post cold war world. We believe in defense conversion, and we think we have to do something about it.

So, this is a different budget because these are extraordinary times that demand fundamental change.

This budget says: We've buried communism, and we must not cling to cold war weapons systems. It says we've nurtured Japan and Europe to maturity, and we must not starve the education and training programs our students and workers need to compete.

This budget says to the thousands of defense workers and veterans who have been discharged that we will not disregard critical investments to make the transition to a peaceful, civilian economy.

This budget says: No more gimmicks, no more Reaganomics, no more cold war weapons, and no more status quo.

More important, this budget says: We're in a recession, and we must begin the urgent task of national reconstruction, recovery and renewal.

This is a good budget. This is a budget for the time of peril and promise in which we live. If we're going to change this country, and I think we must, if we are going to make the economy grow, if we are going to restore optimism and hope for our people, these are the decisions, these are the choices, and this is the budget we must pass.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote for the Democrat budget.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution before us today. This budget presents us with the opportunity to make an increased investment in programs that serve our citizens.

The Budget Committee was faced with some hard choices this year. The 1990 budget

agreement imposed strict limits on spending, and this budget resolution accommodates those restrictions.

Whether we ultimately enact plan A or plan B, this budget succeeds in directing our Nation's investment in human potential through programs such as Head Start, childhood immunizations, and nutrition services. This budget represents the priorities in which we should be investing our resources.

Given the magnitude of the changes that have taken place around the world, it is now the time to reorder our Nation's priorities. No longer do we need to build up weapons systems to protect ourselves from threats overseas. The challenge before us now is to develop weapons against illiteracy, ill-health, and poor nutrition. I believe the budget resolution on the floor today provides us with this opportunity.

One critical area in which this budget meets the needs of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens is in funding for the Social Security Administration. This budget, under both plans A and B, contains additional money to improve the Social Security Administration's ability to process claims for disability, SSI, and Medicare benefits. This money is long overdue. There is presently a backlog of over 800,000 individuals who have filed claims with SSA. This figure is expected to rise to 1.3 million by the end of 1993. SSA estimates that without these additional funds, the waiting period for processing of claims could increase from 3 to 7 months. I am pleased to see this increased funding.

This budget provides a choice to Members as to whether they want to use savings in defense spending to increase investment in domestic programs, or whether those savings should go purely to deficit reduction. Members will have the opportunity to make that choice next week when the House considers legislation to break the firewalls.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution and to support the Conyers bill when it comes to the floor next week. It is our obligation to improve our investment in these programs, and this budget resolution lives up to this challenge.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I rise in opposition to the Democratic budget resolution.

As many of my colleagues have stated today, this budget resolution dramatically demonstrate and contrasts the priorities of the Democratic Party versus those of the President. Where the President wants to slash funding for education and worker retraining, we increase it; where the President provides no funds for economic conversion efforts, we do; where the President's budget fails to realize the need for increased health care funding, we do; where the President wants to slash funding for the low-income home energy assistance program which has helped keep thousands of Rhode Island families warm, the Democratic budget resolution doesn't turn off the heat; and where the President says no to mass transit and job creation, we say all aboard.

While the Democratic budget resolution reflects the goals of fairness and building a better future, it does include one of the President's proposals which I cannot accept in light

of its devastating impact on the welfare of the people of Rhode Island. I am speaking of the President's proposed rescission of funding for the second and third Seawolf submarines. The Budget Committee has included language which lends credence to the President's request to end funding for a program that Congress has already authorized and funded.

The President's rescission proposal pulls the rug out from under the workers who helped win the cold war. Instead of a peace dividend, they get a pink slip. If the President were to ask me what my rescission request would entail, I could easily come up with more than four times his \$6.6 billion solely by cutting the \$29 billion spent on European bases. I also believe that the President's calculated savings from the Seawolf rescission are invalid, but I also believe he is jeopardizing the future of our capability to build submarines.

Mr. Chairman, increased funding for head start, Pell grants, WIC, job training, environmental restoration, veterans programs, health care, AIDS research, mass transit, economic development, housing, and infrastructure, are all extremely important to our future. Although I support these goals and plan to work during the appropriations process to achieve them, I deeply regret that I can not support this budget resolution.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution.

The Democratic budget is a fiscally sound, disciplined plan. It reduces spending wherever possible, it does not violate the budget agreement, and it attacks the deficit, at least 25 percent of any defense savings will go toward deficit reduction.

Our budget takes our financial limitations into consideration, and then shifts our priorities so that we can focus on our current needs. It reflects the changes taking place both in America and throughout the world.

Our defense spending is \$4.2 billion less than the President wants it to be. But it is based on the House Armed Services Committee's updated defense strategy, and addresses our military challenges in this new international environment. Our budget then takes these savings and applies a portion of them to attacking the deficit. It also allows us to reinvest defense savings in economic conversion, including job training for displaced military personnel and defense workers. And the budget includes a 5-percent decrease in funding for both Congress and the President's office.

However, our budget does not sacrifice our critical domestic programs in order to achieve these ends. Unlike the President, we cannot ask our most vulnerable citizens—the unemployed, the underinsured, our senior citizens and retirees, our veterans, our children—to bear the brunt of this burden. Too many Americans are hurting for us to expect them to pay our way out of this financial hole.

What the Democratic budget does is reorder our priorities and, in areas where the President cut critical funding, we either restore or increase it. This includes protecting important programs in health care, job training, housing, nutrition, mass transit, and energy assistance. Our budget rejects all of the President's proposed cuts for Medicare, Federal employees, and veterans.

We put our money into preventive measures that will save us money down the road: medical research, health care, energy conservation, small business financing. Our budget enables us to invest in our important resources—our people, our communities, our infrastructure—and, at the same time, begin to wrestle with this overwhelming deficit.

Chairman PANETTA and the members and staff of the House Budget Committee are to be commended for their outstanding efforts in putting this strategy together. It proves that we can tighten our belts and meet our present, critical needs while we plan for and invest in our future.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I could stand here today and tick off all the things that were wrong with the 1990 budget agreement: higher taxes, illusory spending cuts, ceilings that were too high to begin with. About the only positive aspect of the agreement were the firewalls, presumably put in place to contain spending. Less than 2 years later, here we are to break the budget agreement, and for what? Are we going to repeal the taxes? No; are we going to institute real spending cuts? No; are we going to institute comprehensive budget reform? No; we're here today for all the wrong reasons, breaking the one part of the budget agreement that made some semblance of sense.

Today, the tax and spenders want to go after \$50 billion in defense savings that should go to deficit reduction. Their solution: "Break the budget agreement, tear down the firewalls so the money can be spent." I owe no allegiance to this agreement, I voted against it in 1990, and I don't support it now. The fact remains, however, that the firewalls between the budget categories could be the only remnant of fiscal sanity and discipline left in this institution. Tearing them down would result in less accountability and more spending of money we don't have.

There is more than the question of breaking an agreement here, there is a dangerous message being sent to the American people about the lengths to which the majority will go to pursue their agenda with the taxpayers' money. If they want to get your money and the rules won't let them, they'll just change the rules.

It doesn't work the other way though. If you try to take money out of the Government's hands by repealing bad tax policy, like the luxury tax or the boat user fee, you might as well be moving a mountain.

There have been enormous changes in the world, and it's appropriate that we take into account these new international realities when determining budgetary priorities. But there are troubling budget realities here at home as well, the worst of which is the expected \$400 billion deficit we will run this year. This deficit would be reduced by \$50 billion if we could exercise even a minimum of fiscal control, doing more to improve our economic outlook than any Government spending program could hope to accomplish. Regrettably, however, it appears one thing hasn't changed, and that is this body's voracious appetite for spending at the expense of the economic health of this Nation.

Make no mistake, this is Congress unmasked and at its most greedy. Today's debate gives the American people a rare, sharp-

ly focused look into the differences between us: When given the opportunity, do we spend? Or do we save and invest? My constituents are telling me that Government spends too much, and I agree with them.

A wise newspaper editorial said that the deficit is the running casualty score in the ongoing war between the people's right to pursue their dreams with their own money, and the Government's insistence to pursue its ambitions with the people's money. If these walls come down, the American people will have lost another battle in this war.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 287, the budget resolution for 1993.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues that this House passed a \$1.17 trillion budget resolution for fiscal year 1990. It was supposed to reduce the Federal budget deficit to the \$100 billion target set in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law. But, the actual deficit ultimately amounted to \$220.4 billion after all spending and tax legislation had cleared the Congress for the year.

For fiscal year 1991, the House of Representatives passed a \$1.2 trillion budget resolution. It embodied the famed budget summit agreement that was supposed to produce almost 500 billion dollars' worth of deficit reduction over 5 years.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target was \$64 billion for fiscal year 1991. Yet despite both Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and the summit agreement, the actual deficit ultimately totaled \$268.7 billion.

And again for fiscal year 1992, the House passed a \$1.4 trillion budget resolution that optimistically projected a deficit of \$278.8 billion. The summit agreement had virtually repealed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and ironically in the year that the original Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law was supposed to produce a balanced budget, Congress not only breached the \$278.8 billion deficit in the summit agreement, but produced an actual deficit that will amount to somewhere between \$348.3 and \$400 billion.

The budget resolutions of 1989, 1990, and 1991 were a hoax on the American people. I was one of those Members who voted against each of them.

The reason they all failed was that Congress failed time and again to address the real cause of the budget deficit—excessive Government spending. It was the 1990 budget agreement in particular that both increased taxes and unleashed the greatest domestic spending spree in U.S. history.

As bad as each of those budgets were, though, this budget resolution before us today is even worse. It represents nothing short of a white flag of surrender in the fight to reduce the budget deficit.

It is the product of a congressional majority plagued by infighting and indecision.

The Budget Committee actually produced a budget resolution made up of two complete budget resolutions. Which of the two is to control?

Plan A proposes that any savings from the defense budget be spent on other programs. The problem is, there are no real savings to spend. Anything we don't spend on defense simply means the Government will have to

borrow less next year. And, the deficit will still amount to \$398.2 billion.

Plan B proposes to apply defense savings to deficit reduction, but still leaves a deficit of \$391.4 billion.

This is simply a blueprint for economic disaster.

Mr. Chairman, American families are suffering in recession. Many are out of work or are being laid off. Others fear for the loss of their jobs. Many just can't make ends meet. People are hurting.

Yet last week, the House passed a tax bill that the National Center for Policy Analysis projects will result in the loss of another 100,000 jobs. This week, the Democrat majority brings us a budget with no solution to the Nation's economic problems, but which permits an unprecedented hemorrhaging of the budget for the foreseeable future.

This has got to change. This is the reason that a balanced budget/spending limitation amendment to the Constitution is needed. The majority has neither the courage nor the will to resolve this deficit problem. It's time for the Constitution to be amended to force Congress to do what it won't—balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I tell my colleagues to say "no" to this budget resolution. It is another hoax. It's wrong. It won't work. It should be rejected.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, while we weigh recommendations and priorities for spending, we must not lose sight of the human dimension of cutting the size of the base force. Secretary Cheney and General Powell make compelling arguments from a national security perspective that the base force is the minimum force necessary to guarantee our security in a very uncertain world. The human cost of cutting the base force also must be kept in mind.

I have looked into the faces of both service members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense and seen the uncertainty and anguish when they are faced with the end of their careers. These men and women made a commitment to the defense of this country. They delivered the goods last year in Desert Storm. Now many of them will have to leave. If further cuts in defense manpower reduce this base force, wholesale reductions in force will be necessary.

The recommendations of the Budget Committee, whether you chose plan A or B, would nearly double the already drastic cuts called for by the administration with dramatic effect on manpower levels. Based on a force structure alternative proposed by Chairman ASPIN, the resolution would eliminate an additional 235,000 active and reserve personnel and an undetermined number of DoD civilians.

How do we tell a midcareer officer or non-commissioned officer their services are no longer required? Voluntary separation would not be an option. We would have to fire volunteers who, for a decade or more, have given faithful and honorable service and expected to continue their services until they reached an honorable and well-deserved retirement. We have a moral obligation to these warriors who have dedicated themselves to the defense of this country.

We must not forget the civilian employees, no less committed to national defense. It is no

easier to look welders or budget analysts in the eye and tell them they don't have a job. Let us not lose sight of the fact that while there are layoffs in other industries, most of these people have skills not much in demand in the private sector. Like their uniformed counterparts, they made a choice to serve.

In the debate over this budget we must remember these great Americans. Preserve the base force.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 287, the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution. Again, the Budget Committee has abrogated its responsibility and presented the House with a budget resolution that avoids tough choices and uses legerdemain to obscure fiscal reality.

Since the Budget Committee was unable to reach a consensus on whether to use the peace dividend for new spending or deficit reduction, the budget resolution provides for an unprecedented two plan approach. Under the budget resolution, plan A would spend 70 percent of fiscal year 1993 defense savings, while plan B would earmark all defense savings for deficit reduction. Plan A would only take effect if the Budget Reform Act of 1992—which seeks to tear down the budget walls established under the 1990 budget enforcement agreement—is law when conferees are appointed to resolve differences in the House and Senate adopted budget resolutions.

Although the House has yet to vote on the Budget Reform Act, many of my colleagues know that the President has already signalled that he would veto the bill, and it is highly unlikely that either chamber will be able to override. Thus in this election year I think it is apparent that this budget resolution does nothing more than tantalize the American people with the prospect of more spending on popular domestic programs such as education, job training, housing, WIC, Head Start, and mass transit, when in reality the Appropriation's Committee will not be able to deliver.

Moreover, it is important to note that the peace dividend is not extra money that can be reprogrammed. Until the \$400 billion budget deficit is erased, spending cuts anywhere will produce no real dividends, they will only reduce losses.

While I oppose the budget resolution because it fails to make tough choices, I do support the committee's recommendation to double the President's proposed defense cuts. With the dramatic changes that have taken place in Eastern Europe and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, I also think it is imperative for the Congress to revisit the spending caps set forth under the 1990 budget agreement. However, after a decade of unprecedented budget deficits, I believe that we must take full advantage of this historic opportunity to use the peace dividend largely to reduce the budget deficit.

While reducing our budget deficit remains a difficult and elusive goal, it is essential. It is alarming that at present we are spending more to pay interest on our debt—projected at \$315 billion annually—than we do on all domestic discretionary programs. If it were not for past indulgent overspending we would have twice as much money available to help the homeless, fight AIDS, improve education,

and rebuild our Nation's ailing infrastructure. Let's remember that reducing the deficit is an investment in America's future.

Furthermore, I am concerned that beyond assuming some unspecified savings the budget resolution completely ignores entitlement reform. If one were to look at the changes that have transpired since the 1960's with regard to the Federal budget, one trend stands out. Mandatory or entitlement spending has grown from 28 percent of the budget under President Kennedy to over 50 percent today. Therefore, any efforts to reduce our budget deficit must target, and not ignore, mandatory spending.

As a Member who has served on the Appropriations Committee for over a decade, I am well aware of the current restraints on the domestic discretionary spending account. Like many, I support increased funding for education, housing, mass transit, AIDS research, and other vital domestic programs. However, unlike the Budget Committee, I believe that we must make some difficult choices especially if we are forced to work with existing resources. For example, I have long advocated canceling NASA's space station. Such a move would save billions, which could be spent on vital domestic initiatives.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues to vote against the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution because it fails to make tough choices and does not adequately address the priority of deficit reduction. Both are necessary if we are ever going to provide a budget with the resources that address the needs and concerns of the American people.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, today we will consider the Democratic budget resolution.

I am pleased to say that our budget resolution is a good one.

And I am especially pleased to say that it draws clear lines between Democrats and Republicans, between Democrats and the administration.

The Democratic budget reinvests in America. It creates jobs, provides housing, nutritional assistance, and loans for higher education.

It helps low-income families pay their energy bills. It provides improved health care for our veterans.

This is a good resolution, unlike the President's budget which was soundly rejected yesterday.

Don't believe the negative rhetoric you'll hear today. Our budget is a good one.

It should and will be passed.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that the budgetary process is in need of comprehensive reform, therefore I must regrettably oppose all five budget bills before this body.

I'm drawing my own line over the red ink. All five budget bills have one thing in common: They rely on mortgaging our children's future through continued deficit spending.

I cannot support legislation that ignores fundamental problems with the budget process and ensures a continued cycle of deficit spending. We need serious restructuring of the budgetary process, a budget perestroika, that puts our house in order so that we can face the challenges of the future.

Congress has to get serious about wasteful Government spending and deficit reduction

through budget perestroika, a restructuring of how we do business which I see would consist of three major elements:

First, a long-term commitment to deficit reduction combined with a flexible spending freeze to restore the confidence of taxpayers in the ability of Congress to get our fiscal house in order.

Second, budget containment through a two step budgetary process. Budget caps would be set early in the process that can be reduced in the case of revenue shortfalls and increased when there are revenue surpluses.

And finally, an increase in revenues through elimination of tax loopholes, except those which benefit broad segments of society, and the replacement of present tax policies, which encourage tax avoidance and evasion, with a simplified system of taxation.

These are all sound fiscal practices, but they are especially relevant now as we face the three converging economic challenges: the recession, the end of the cold war, and our debt-burdened society.

In this situation, the old standby economic medicine has gone bad in the bottle. We can no longer spend our way out of a recession.

I am not saying that we must develop such a spartan budget that we eliminate all the necessary services that only Government can provide. The Federal Government will always have a vital role in maintaining a strong defense, ensuring environmental protection, and providing essential services to those least able to help themselves.

But Congress needs to adjust to the realities of the 90's and begin to solve problems, not perpetuate or create them. Therefore, along with a restructuring of how we develop our budget, we need to change our budget priorities.

We should examine further cuts in defense spending once we have formulated a defense strategy to deter belligerent governments in Korea and the Middle East, and to deal with the unstable situation in the Commonwealth of Independent States and nuclear proliferation problems with China.

We must replace welfare and housing programs that offer band-aid approaches and encourage Government dependency with programs that promote personal responsibility and empower individuals to provide for themselves.

Congress must shift spending to increase research and development of alternative energy sources and clean burning fuels to ensure America's energy independence and improve the environment.

We must support long-term cost-effective programs that prevent rather than react to social problems, such as a wellness approach to health care.

Finally, there must be a dramatic movement toward a qualitative, performance-based approach to Government that emphasizes quality services; micromanagement and employee accountability; incentives for wise spending including the elimination of the Government's end of the year spend-it-or-lose-it policy; and increased competitive bidding contracting of Government services.

I regret the necessity to reject all the budget proposals, but the time has come for budget perestroika. By saying no today, I am begin-

ning a positive process of change for tomorrow.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote in support of the budget resolution that has been produced by the House Budget Committee because I believe that it is far more responsive to the myriad challenges America faces in the post-cold-war-era than the budget the President has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, ours is a country in crisis. We have an economy in tatters, the consequence of too many years of self-indulgent spending and short-term profit taking at the expense of the savings and investment critical to long-run economic performance. Declining rates of productivity growth did not begin with the Reagan year, but the supply-side economic policies of the past dozen years certainly worsened an already bad situation. After all of the tax breaks that were given to both businesses and to individuals—particularly to persons at the upper end of the economic ladder—productivity today is down; investment is down; unemployment is up; deficits are at an unprecedented high; America has moved from the position of the world's largest creditor nation to that of the world's largest debtor nation; and American workers continue to be victimized by the undermining of America's ability to compete in the international marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, the erosion of America's economic strength has been sharply intensified by the spending and taxing priorities of the past dozen years. It would not be particularly productive at this point to debate the wisdom of the huge military buildup that occurred over this period. But we need to understand the costs that the United States incurred, particularly in relationship to our principal trading partners and competitors. While we have been spending between 6 and 7 percent of America's wealth in defending the rest of the world, our allies were spending far less: in Europe, defense expenditures amounted to roughly 3 percent or less of the national product of our allies; in Japan, the comparable figure was 1 percent. And, while we were busy providing the defense umbrella for both Europe and Asia in these years, our allies were taking their resources and investing them in new plants and equipment, in research and development, in new technologies, in education, in worker training and retraining. By contrast, America dramatically reduced its expenditures in all of these areas, the very areas most critical to economic performance. When Ronald Reagan took office in 1981, investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, job training, and scientific research accounted for 13.8 percent of all Federal budget authority; today, by contrast, investment in such areas represents only 9.4 percent of the Federal budget. Is it any wonder—given the fundamental shift in American budget priorities that occurred the past dozen years—that America's competitiveness has declined so sharply?

Mr. Chairman, the major threat to America is no longer a hostile and powerful Soviet Union; it is the threat of internal decay. What we are left with today—after 12 years of supply-side economics—is collapsing productivity, a declining standard of living, and widening inequalities, the likes of which we have not seen since the years of the Great Depression. In

the last decade, for example, 60 percent of the income growth that occurred in this country went to the richest 1 percent of Americans. Consequently, today the wealthiest 1 percent, 2½ million Americans, bring in more income than the bottom 40 percent, or some 100 million Americans.

The product of this economic deterioration is new social unrest: intensifying racial and ethnic and class conflicts represent an immediate and growing threat to our domestic peace and tranquility. Make no mistake about it: There is a direct relationship between the sense of diminished opportunities and increased hopelessness, on the one hand, and all of the social pathology manifested in the rising tide of drug abuse, crime and violence. Americans everywhere feel increasingly out of control, unable to protect themselves or their families, and anxious about their futures.

Nowhere is the emerging social crisis more evident than when we look at the status of American children. Today, there are over 330,000 children who are homeless; the suicide rate for teenagers has tripled since 1960; and we have one of the highest infant mortality rates in the industrialized world. Indeed, we can't even ensure the safety of our kids in their homes or on the streets. Each day in the United States an average of 10 youngsters are shot dead.

Mr. Chairman, we are a society and a nation in crisis. And incrementalism will simply not be a sufficient response to the challenges we face. What is needed is a fundamental reordering of national priorities. And the good news is that the end of the cold war—the collapse of the Soviet Union and of the Warsaw Pact—provide us with an opportunity to achieve this fundamental redirection.

The real question before us is whether we will have the courage and the vision to get beyond the perspectives and ways of thinking forged in the years of the cold war to realize the full potential of a changing world. The real question is whether we will have the courage to challenge those bureaucratic and other vested interests that still offer up every conceivable rationalization for holding on to the status quo and resisting fundamental change. The real question is whether we will seize the opportunity that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, today we have that opportunity before us: An opportunity to reap the rewards of the end of the cold war; an opportunity to change course and reinvest in America. Unlike the Bush budget which looks to the past, the budget resolution before us today turns the corner to our future by reordering our national priorities.

Unlike the President's budget, the House Democratic Budget targets our Nation's resources to investments that will create jobs, contribute to long-term increases in productivity and incomes, and produce a far more secure and prosperous future for all Americans.

The resolution increases funding above the President's recommendations for preschool, elementary and secondary education, and for higher education tuition assistance. And it addresses the costs of the recession and the short-term costs of reduced defense spending through an increase in job training funds for young adults and displaced workers.

The Democratic budget invests more in health care than would the President, espe-

cially for nutrition and preventative programs that will save the public huge sums in the long run by keeping people healthy. It also funds higher levels of research in medical science and technology, particularly in such areas as cancer, AIDS, cardiovascular disease, and underresearched medical problems affecting women.

Finally, the resolution will help create jobs, spur economic growth, and help our economy make an adjustment away from defense to nondefense applications. It provides additional funding for science and technology, and for research into critical energy conservation and renewable energy programs. It provides increased financing for small businesses and it funds infrastructure investments well above the President's recommendations.

All of these funding changes are buttressed by a stiff budget discipline: The budget resolution provides more deficit reduction than required by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, it achieves a lower deficit than proposed by the President, and it avoids the gimmickry the President resorted to in his budget. The House Democratic budget achieves greater savings in the defense function, and then dedicates a third of those savings to deeper deficit reduction and the remainder to pressing domestic needs.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget looks to the past, while the Democratic budget looks to the future. The Democratic budget recognizes the changes that have taken place in this world of ours, and redirects some of the resources that have been directed overseas to the task of rebuilding and renewing America. The dividends realized from this change in course will be realized in a stronger and more prosperous and secure America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the budget resolution that has been reported by the House Budget Committee.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the budget resolution, approved by the House Budget Committee, which controls spending for the fiscal year beginning this coming October 1.

This budget resolution follows on the heels of the 1990 budget summit agreement I supported to help put the fiscal books of the Federal Government in order. That measure called for \$496.3 billion in deficit reduction through fiscal year 1995. The budget resolution conforms to the overall spending limits of the 1990 budget agreement and achieves a lower deficit than that proposed by the President. It makes choices that are tough, but this action is necessary for the economic future of the Nation.

It reinvests in America through programs in health, education, jobs and long-term growth. The President's \$14 billion cut in Medicare is rejected, as well as a \$3.5 billion cut in veterans programs. The deficit reduction it provides will in the long run raise national saving, investment, economic growth and living standards. It will free the resources now going to pay the interest on the national debt for investments in the Nation's infrastructure and job creation.

The debt burden has a tremendous impact on the fiscal and economic well-being of the Nation. This year, the Federal Government will

borrow close to \$400 billion to run its programs, with the interest on our cumulative debt taking almost one budget dollar in seven. This crushing debt continues to stifle economic growth and burden future generations. We must use the historic opportunity provided by the end of the cold war to reduce our deficit. This is the most responsible and responsible step we can take to turn the economy around.

Since the budget resolution is somewhat more complicated this year, it's important to look at how the resolution is framed. In addition to the spending reductions contained in the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act, there was a lesser known provision which established spending caps in three categories, domestic, defense, and foreign aid. The budget summit agreement prohibits spending transfers between these firewalls or areas of spending.

The budget resolution provides for a two-track approach to the 1993 budget. Plan A assumes that the firewalls separating defense, international and domestic discretionary spending are removed in 1993, a year early, and that defense savings are available for additional domestic spending. Plan B assumes that the walls remain in place.

A bill removing the walls is expected to follow the budget resolution to the House floor. If this subsequent legislation is adopted, plan A would be implemented. If it isn't enacted by the time House-Senate conferees go to work, plan B is effective. The budget resolution leaves the options open at this time.

Under plan A some of the savings achieved from defense cuts go to deficit reduction, some to domestic initiatives. Under plan B, the savings all go to deficit reduction.

I strongly support plan B—using savings from the so-called peace dividend for deficit reduction and I will oppose the subsequent legislation to remove the walls between defense and nondefense spending. I feel that we should maintain the fiscal discipline imposed by the 1990 budget summit agreement. My concern is that if we move to one overall spending cap, total spending may be higher than if the three separate caps were maintained. If we keep the firewalls up, the chances are much greater that the defense savings can be used to reduce the Federal deficit.

I feel the Nation would be far better served if we use the savings from the peace dividend to keep the deficit down. The burden of deficit reduction is shared by all of us. The national debt has tripled in just 10 years helping to plunge the economy into recession. Yearly interest payments on the debt cripple our ability to make desperately needed investments in manufacturing, transportation, education, and other areas.

If we are to build new businesses, and provide incentives for growth and job creation, we must stop the flow of tax dollars used to pay off old debts. That's why I will continue to support efforts to confront our deficit problem head on. The mounting federal debt can no longer be ignored. It must be addressed. I urge my colleague to work with me to bring down the deficit. Support the House Budget Committee resolution and oppose the effort to tear down the budget summit agreement's spending walls.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, Congress is again presented with an array of budget choices. While only one will prevail, they must all be debated. I will not be voting for any of the budgets being debated here today.

I will vote against the budget offered by the Democrats for it proposes an unprecedented tax increase and the removal of the firewalls established by the 1990 budget agreement. If the taxpayers are stuck with the tax increases included in the 1990 budget agreement, then Congress should be stuck with the spending caps and walls that the agreement included. If these were not reasons enough to vote against the Democrat budget, the Democrats decided to propose two different budgets, refusing to choose one which they will pursue. While I am encouraged by the effort shown to include the concerns of members who want to see the deficit taken under control, I have little reassurance that the Democrats have any intention of pursuing plan B after the bill is passed.

The overall reason I will vote against all budgets proposed during the debate is that I believe the defense cuts proposed have been made hastily. The effect of such drastic cuts, such as proposed by the Democrats and the Dellums-Towns alternative budget, will prolong the recession and stagnate the economy. I also don't believe that this country is now free of a threat to our national security.

I am concerned that the proposed defense budgets have been presented without much thought or consideration. The House Armed Services Committee has been waiting for the 180-day study to come out of the Department of the Navy. We hope this study will tell us what effect the President's proposal to cut the remaining two Seawolf submarines will have on our national security and our defense industrial base. How can we accurately design our force structure without the results of this study or a possible threat assessment? Neither of these important issues has been addressed. I fear that when the next conflict arises, we will not be prepared. What it all comes down to is readiness. Historically this country has not been able to restructure and resize our Armed Forces successfully. Every time we have attempted this we have created a hollow force. If we hope to maintain two shipyards, we must consider the affect these cuts will have on our industrial base.

I think a mood has developed in this Congress to cut numbers/dollars recklessly under the guise of helping our economy, but the reality is they are cutting peoples jobs and in effect hurting our economy. These same individuals feel there is no more threat that the fall of communism in the Soviet Union means the evil empire is gone. Perhaps it is gone, but the weapons it once created are not. While we may now feel that these weapons are currently under control, I don't think any of us can assure this country that they will be forever under control. Can we guarantee that when there is turmoil, or uprising in the former Soviet Union because of the economy, that the weapons will not be used or sold on the market to other third world countries? If these individuals prove to be successful in their election year move, I fear we are all in for dangerous and economically difficult times.

While making drastic cuts in defense spending, no budget made enough of an adjustment in funding for job training programs. Many military personnel will be dismissed. Many military contractors and their employees will go out of business due to weapons cancellations. These people will need job training to make the transition from a defense economy to a peace time economy. Careful planning in this area has not yet occurred. In addition, the passage of last week's economic growth legislation will do little to expand the economy in areas which could absorb these workers.

The President's budget also contains large cuts in Federal assistance to cities and States. The Community Services Block Grant Program was cut completely. Last year alone Connecticut received \$4.4 million to support the administration of local community action agencies which assisted low-income residents. This year they will receive nothing if the President's budget were enacted. Funding for the Community Development Block Grant Program was also cut. Again Connecticut programs will suffer from Federal cuts. Cities and States are already struggling to meet current service demands. During the recession demands for services funded in part by Federal funds have risen. In the midst of all this the Federal Government proposes cutting funds for the programs that support these individuals. I cannot support this effort.

I would like to express my support for the increases in spending the President's budget recommends for the Head Start Program, the Women, Infant, and Children [WIC] Program, infrastructure projects, and research and development, which will assist in the long-term growth and prosperity of this country. I am also in strong support of the increase for Project Hope in the President's budget. Connecticut would receive about \$9.8 million for this program as compared to \$3.5 million in fiscal year 1992, allowing many more families to achieve their dream of owning their own home.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the defense cuts proposed by each budget proposal were made in haste. Insufficient time and consideration was given to the effects such cuts would have on the employment sector and the defense industrial base. I cannot support these cuts which did not receive proper planning. I will not vote for any of the budgets presented on the House floor during this debate.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that we have three different budget proposals before us, I cannot find one that adequately deals with the pressing challenges facing our Government.

We are faced with several clearly defined problems that must be addressed squarely for our Nation to prosper. We have a huge budget deficit, with a national debt that is weighing upon the entire economy. More and more of our children live in poverty, and our educational system is failing to give them the skills they need to be competitive workers in a demanding global economy. Our commercial infrastructure has suffered from a decade of neglect, and we have numerous problems with our health care system, including a tragic AIDS epidemic.

Normally we would respond to a recession like this one by increasing Government spend-

ing to meet the greater public needs and to prime the economy and get it moving. Unfortunately, we squandered the good times of the mid-eighties, ran huge deficits even as the economy grew, and we are now mired in debt and are paying the price for those excessive policies.

It is important to keep in mind the full consequences of a deficit. The Government must make up for the deficit by borrowing those funds, \$400 billion under President Bush's fiscal 1993 budget proposal. And where does that money come from? It comes from the same private investors who would otherwise be investing in private businesses. At a time when both parties are offering tax plans to encourage more investment, increased deficit spending is drawing huge amounts of money out of the private economy to buy the Treasury bills that finance our debt.

If we want real investment in the private sector—enough to create jobs—we have to cut spending to reduce the deficit. To get our economy moving and to prepare our industries to compete in the next century, we also have to focus the remaining scarce resources on the most critical needs: Health care, education, infrastructure, technology development, and industrial competitiveness. None of the budget proposals before us today do that in a reasonable fashion.

In the past few years, the largest threat to our national security, the Soviet Union, has dissolved. Roughly 40 percent of our military spending in the 1980's was directly focused on countering the Soviet threat and much of the remaining 60 percent was related to it. Most of that spending is no longer needed or justified.

In addition, last year we destroyed most of the tanks and artillery belonging to Iraq—formerly the fourth largest army in the world. The combined reduction of Soviet and Iraqi forces drastically reduces the possible threats our Armed Services may need to counter, but you would never know it if you looked at the President's or the Budget Committee's proposals.

President Bush's budget calls for only a 1.6-percent reduction in defense outlays below current services levels, and his long-term defense plans would leave 150,000 U.S. troops in Europe through the end of 1995. Even the cuts proposed by the Budget Committee only amount to a 3-percent reduction.

While we need to achieve more savings in the military budget, the Black Caucus proposal is excessive if not unrealistic in calling for cutting defense outlays by 7 percent and budget authority by 17 percent. Reducing our military structure requires environmental cleanups at closed bases, severance payments to personnel, and other transitional expenses. Because these and other costs reduce the short-term savings from closing bases and canceling programs, such cuts in 1 year would be too drastic.

The American public is demanding that we focus on the pressing problems here at home. However, these budget proposals are floating in space—literally. President Bush and the Budget Committee both propose cutting many areas of domestic spending while increasing foreign aid and NASA's space programs.

America needs an industrial policy to convert our great research capabilities into pro-

ductive technologies. Rather than spending \$2 billion on the space station we need to develop new manufacturing technologies to put Americans to work here on Earth. Rather than spending \$37 million on mapping the Moon, we need to make sure that our kids can read a map.

Just as the changes in the world have reduced our need for military spending, those changes have reduced the need for spending over \$7 billion on military aid to other countries. Our local police departments, courts, and prisons could certainly use some additional funds to fight the war on drugs.

Perhaps the greatest foreign threat to national security may now be the weakness, rather than the strength, of the former Soviet Union. In the new Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] and the other former Soviet Republics there is a dangerous blend of poverty, chaos, and advanced weapons. Soviet scientists and military commanders may well sell their weapons and weapons technology to terrorist nations if the alternative is poverty.

We can either help new CIS develop free markets and stable democratic governments, or we can run the risk of seeing advanced Soviet weapons and nuclear and chemical weapons technology in the hands of terrorists and Third World dictators. While the President has proposed \$620 million in aid to the CIS over 18 months, this amount is less than the cost of one B-2 bomber. We can do much more to enhance our security by shifting some funds from untested weapons like the B-2 to helping the Soviets destroy their weapons and convert their weapons factories to peaceful commercial uses so that no more weapons are built.

Though I will vote against all three proposals for the reasons outlined above, there are some good things in these budgets. The Democratic plan A increases education funding by 15 percent, Head Start by 36 percent, WIC by 15 percent, Community Development Block Grants by 3 percent, AIDS-related programs by 22 percent, job training by 17 percent, and highway and mass transit programs by 14 percent. These initiatives will help ease the pain of the recession and get the economy headed in the right direction. At the same time, however, I do have serious concerns about the Government's ability to manage that much growth in some of those programs in 1 year.

Despite these increases, we will be forced to cut these important programs in the future if we do not balance the budget because of rising interest payments on the national debt. Cutting defense, foreign aid, and space projects could help us on this front. President Bush is also correct in calling for greater restraint in the growth of Medicare spending.

Medicare premiums and payroll contributions fall far short of covering the cost of the program. In fact, 75 percent of Medicare part B costs are paid out of general tax dollars. President Bush is correct to propose that individuals with incomes over \$100,000 per year should pay their own Medicare part B premiums. Medicare is one of the fastest growing areas of Federal spending, and we must control Medicare costs if we are to reduce the deficit.

I believe we need a budget that better reflects the urgent needs of today. We need to

cut at least another \$10 to \$12 billion from defense, foreign aid, and space programs. Most of those cuts should be used to reduce the deficit and free up capital for private investment, and about 30 to 40 percent should be targeted to our most pressing domestic needs. At the same time, we need to develop a tax bill that will similarly use tax incentives to direct private resources toward investment and job creation.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution is merely the first step in a long budget process, and I urge my colleagues to carefully consider where our resources can do the most for our economy as we enter the authorization and appropriations process. I hope the conference with the Senate moves our country in the directions I propose, for I believe that these steps are the only way to put America back to work and ensure our competitiveness in the years ahead.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, as the House nears a vote today on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1993, we are reminded of the critical impact our budget priorities have on the direction of the economy.

We are struggling to overcome a long recession, in which millions of American workers have lost jobs or fear losing them. We are responding to changes in the Soviet Union which allow us to modify our strategic planning. We are reordering our funding priorities to get this country back on the right track.

A key component of the budget resolution is the defense recommendation. Thankfully, the end of the cold war provides us with a true peace dividend, about \$14 billion in budget authority and \$9 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1993. This is a unique opportunity which allows us to reinvest in our tense economy. This opportunity relies on support for a subsequent change in the 1990 budget act allowing a shift of defense savings to domestic priorities. Since this change will be debated separately, the House budget plan is structured into a plan A, which assumes defense savings will be reinvested in the economy, and plan B, which assumes defense savings will be used only for deficit reduction. As an original cosponsor of legislation (H.R. 3732) removing the walls separating defense and domestic spending, plan A has my support.

Converting from the huge defense buildup of the past decade to a modern defense strategy clearly is not without difficulties, especially for those employed in the defense industry. In response, House Concurrent Resolution 287 targets an additional \$1 billion in retraining and employment assistance for dislocated defense workers.

Regarding job opportunities for those struggling through the economic downturn, the budget resolution invests in funding items which will create employment, as many as 400,000 new jobs. For instance, the House budget resolution provides more support for highways, transit, community development, and housing. This will not only improve the infrastructure and fight homelessness, but could create jobs for 338,000 Americans.

Both plan A and plan B reject unfair cuts in Medicare, veterans and Federal employee benefits. President Bush requested a \$13.9 billion cut in Medicare, and \$3.5 billion cut in veterans programs over 5 years. The House

budget plan restores support for these programs, and recommends \$2 billion in other entitlement savings for fiscal year 1993.

House Concurrent Resolution 287 also rejects the President's reductions in mass transit, Amtrak, low-income energy assistance, elderly and disabled housing, economic development, and other budget items. The House budget plan provides greater investment in infrastructure, in human capital programs like job training and education, and health care for infants, struggling parents, immunizations, AIDS, and other health research.

Without question, we must work with limited resources. However, we can better meet this challenge by adopting the recommendations of the House budget resolution, which will provide needed public investment and jobs, and retool our economy to be competitive in a changing world. I urge your support for House Concurrent Resolution 287.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of plan B of the Democratic budget proposal. In this season of budget politics, and fiscal gimmickry, this package is a serious effort to address the needs of the country in a fiscally responsible manner.

The budget proposal contains funding for domestic needs, a strong defense, stays within the caps of the 1990 budget agreement, and makes significant steps toward deficit reduction. While the overall differences are not that great, the programmatic emphasis in each of the packages does reflect a fundamental difference in priorities.

The Democratic package contains increases in Head Start, education, economic conversion, infrastructure, and other areas. It is this type of investment in our future that will determine our long-term well-being. To pay for these increases, the budget plan cuts legislative and executive branch costs, and saves money through Federal work force attrition and other areas.

Furthermore, the plan does not include the Medicare cuts which the President's package contained, nor the taxation of annuities, of credit unions or of securities inventories which were also in the President's package. Plan B also does not resort to accounting gimmicks to reach its deficit reduction targets. It also reduces the deficit to a greater extent than provided by the administration's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am not supporting plan A, and consequently, the elimination of the firewalls, for a few reasons. First, I don't believe we should be backing away from the 1990 budget agreement and the fiscal discipline which it created. Eliminating the firewalls would be a breach of what little discipline we have in the budget process, and I don't see that as a responsible action, regardless of how the money is to be spent.

Federal spending is up to 25.2 percent of gross domestic product this year as opposed to 22.1 percent just 4 years ago. This kind of spending is simply unsustainable.

Second, plan A increases spending over and above the increases authorized by plan B. Third, elimination of the firewalls would result in a faster military drawdown than would be prudent either economically or militarily. Fourth, and most important, these extra increases do little to invest in America's immediate future. It does very little to create jobs,

to build roads, sewers, fix bridges or earn any kind of economic return. We would almost be better off returning the peace dividend to State and local authorities to make needed investments in infrastructure.

If we are going to provide any new spending, it has to be in capital investment, and should meet the same requirements which the States or which businesses require of their capital programs. Plan A does not do that, and I do not think the American people will support the continued spending embodied in plan A.

I would like to support plan A. Everyone would like to see more funding for worthy projects. But, regardless of their merit we cannot continue borrowing money to pay for programs with no serious plan as to how to pay for them. While this assuages our conscience, it will ultimately bankrupt the country.

Let me turn briefly to defense. Many have raised concerns that the defense figures contained in the budget will somehow gut the preparedness of the country. This is ludicrous. To begin with, there is only a 2.5-percent difference between the House proposal and the President's proposal. If 2.5 percent will somehow cut the heart out of an enterprise which spends hundreds of billions of dollars annually, there is something seriously wrong with the Pentagon. Furthermore, the House Budget Committee based its figure on the Armed Services Committee recommendations, which in turn was the result of a thorough review of our defense needs and force structure requirements.

While the details have yet to be worked out, it is clear that the thrust is sound. The Armed Services Committee has put a good deal of effort in reevaluating the fundamental threats and contingencies in the international arena, and has based our military procurement and structure on the types of conflicts we are likely to face, and does not base spending on a threat which has passed.

A good example of this is the money spent on defending Western Europe. Fifty years after World War II, we are still spending well over \$150 billion to maintain significant forces in Western Europe, Korea, and Japan. The President's package continues this trend. Unfortunately, this is a luxury we can no longer afford.

The State of Maryland, collectively, contributed over \$5 billion on Federal military spending, which is more than it spent as a State on education. Furthermore, this means that the State spent roughly \$2.5 billion defending Western Europe and Japan. I am a stalwart advocate of a strong defense, but I am against wasted resources.

The President's base force policy does not fit the new world order. It is still fighting the Soviets, and attempts to continue spending in all categories at lower levels. This can only result in a hollowing-out of our forces.

What we need is a restructured defense, one that can do more with less. It will need to have a smaller active component, better balanced, with an emphasis on support forces, technological development, and integration. To achieve this end, there will be a need to rely upon strong and capable reserves, and a greater effort to eliminate waste. The Armed Services Committee approach is in tune with these realities.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my support for plan B of the Democratic budget package. I have a strong record on defense, and have always supported a high level of defense spending. I also pride myself of being a fiscal conservative, and have made tough votes in both of these areas.

The American public has sent a clear message to the Congress that they do not want the peace dividend squandered. Frankly, they don't trust us. They think that we'll take all the money we cut from the defense budget, do nothing to reduce the deficit, and continue on a fiscally irresponsible policy of promising everything, and sending the bill to the American taxpayer. This is our opportunity to respond to that message and say, "We hear you." Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the long-term interests of the Nation—vote in favor of the budget package which continues funding of all programs at intelligent levels and directs the defense spending cuts toward deficit reduction. Plan B meets these requirements, and I am pleased to be a supporter.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear—although perhaps I should not be surprised—that the minority may move to divide the question. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] has not even indicated that to me, but I think it is only in fairness to the Members that we get some indication as to whether or not that would be the case because Members are anxious to get home.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for that purpose. Would he advise us as to his intention?

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time we will follow the rules. It is our intention to do that on the floor, as we attempted to do it unsuccessfully in the committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say to the Members that I think the members of the Committee on the Budget deserve the respect of having a vote on the resolution as we brought it to the floor. If the move is to divide it, then I would ask Members to support both votes.

I will tell the Members I regret that there may be two votes, but that is the minority's decision. I would just ask the Members on our side to please stick with the committee and vote aye on both proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MFUME, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 287) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995,

1996, and 1997, pursuant to House Resolution 386, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question on the resolution and specifically ask for a separate vote on section 3. Pending the determination of the Chair as to the resolution's divisibility, I would like to be heard on that question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may not debate a demand which has not been subject to a point of order.

Section 3 is subject to a division of the question, and a separate vote will be held on that portion of the concurrent resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the Chair to clarify this decision and the fact that there will be a separate vote on both parts of this budget.

□ 1850

The SPEAKER. The demand has been made that there be a division of the question and a separate vote on section 3. The Chair has ruled and is prepared to put the question in a divided form, the two parts of the vote to occur immediately without further intervening debate, so that what would normally have been accomplished in a single vote on the adoption of the resolution will now require two votes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. This vote will be on sections 1, 2, and 4. The second vote will be on section 3.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. With respect to the Chair's statement, we just could not hear on this side of the aisle. Let me just state it as I understood it.

My parliamentary inquiry is that the Chair has held that the question is divisible and, therefore, the first vote would occur on sections 1, 2, and 4, the so-called plan A no firewalls budget, and Members then would have a separate vote on which to express themselves as to whether or not they want a budget without firewalls. I am just asking for clarification because I thought that is what the Chair said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is going beyond a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair has ruled that the demand for a division of the question is in order, and the Chair will put the question separately.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that if both passed, the resolution would unify both so that the decision ultimately as to what path would be taken will be voted on next week?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on sections 1, 2, and 4 of House Concurrent Resolution 287.

Without objection the yeas and nays are ordered.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 201, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Owens (NY)
Ackerman	Gordon	Panetta
Alexander	Guarini	Pastor
Anderson	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (ME)	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Andrews (TX)	Harris	Pease
Annunzio	Hatcher	Pelosi
Anthony	Hayes (IL)	Penny
Aspin	Hefner	Perkins
Atkins	Hertel	Peterson (FL)
AuCoin	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)
Bacchus	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Bellenson	Horn	Poshard
Berman	Hoyer	Price
Bevill	Hubbard	Rahall
Bilbray	Jefferson	Rangel
Blackwell	Jenkins	Ray
Bonior	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Borski	Johnston	Roe
Boucher	Jones (GA)	Rose
Boxer	Jones (NC)	Rostenkowski
Brewster	Kanjorski	Roybal
Brooks	Kaptur	Sabo
Browder	Kennedy	Sanders
Brown	Kildee	Sangmeister
Bruce	Kleczka	Savage
Bryant	Kolter	Sawyer
Bustamante	Kopetski	Scheuer
Cardin	Kostmayer	Schroeder
Carper	LaFalce	Schumer
Clay	Lantos	Serrano
Clement	LaRocco	Sharp
Collins (MI)	Lehman (CA)	Sikorski
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Skaggs
Cooper	Levin (MI)	Slattery
Costello	Levine (CA)	Slaughter
Cox (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (FL)
Coyne	Long	Smith (IA)
Cramer	Lowey (NY)	Solarz
Darden	Manton	Spratt
de la Garza	Markey	Stallings
DeFazio	Martinez	Stark
Dellums	Matsui	Stenholm
Derrick	Mavroules	Stokes
Dicks	Mazzoli	Studds
Dingell	McCloskey	Swett
Dixon	McCurdy	Swift
Donnelly	McDermott	Synar
Downey	McHugh	Tallon
Durbin	McMillen (MD)	Tanner
Dwyer	McNulty	Thomas (GA)
Early	Mfume	Thornton
Eckart	Miller (CA)	Torres
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Torricelli
Engel	Mink	Towns
Erdreich	Moakley	Trafficant
Espy	Mollohan	Traxler
Evans	Moody	Unsoeld
Fascell	Moran	Vento
Fazio	Mrazek	Volkmer
Feighan	Murphy	Washington
Flake	Murtha	Waters
Foglietta	Nagle	Waxman
Foley	Natcher	Weiss
Ford (MI)	Neal (MA)	Wheat
Ford (TN)	Neal (NC)	Williams
Frank (MA)	Nowak	Wilson
Frost	Oakar	Wise
Gaydos	Oberstar	Wolpe
Gephardt	Obey	Wyden
Gibbons	Olin	Yatron
Glickman	Olver	

NAYS—201

Allard
Allen
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Carr
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Condit
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
DeLauro
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy

Green
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Jontz
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Lowery (CA)
Luken
Machtle
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard

Pallone
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Pursell
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stearns
Stump
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wyllie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Baker
Boehner
Chandler
Collins (IL)
Dannemeyer
Davis
Dooley

Dymally
Ireland
Jacobs
Lipinski
Livingston
Ortiz
Owens (UT)

Quillen
Russo
Sundquist
Whitten
Yates

Mr. HUCKABY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So sections 1, 2, and 4 of House Concurrent Resolution 287 were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on section 3 of House Concurrent Resolution 287.

Without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Bellenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Cardin
Carper
Clay
Clement
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Dunbar
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fasell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy

Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markley
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Oliver

Owens (NY)
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Richardson
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallion
Tanner
Tauzin
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traffant
Traxler
Unsold
Valentine
Vento
Volkmeyer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yatron

NAYS—191

Allard
Allen
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis

Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Broomfield
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Carr
Chapman
Clinger

Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
DeLauro
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dreier

Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Green
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Jontz
Kasich

Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Machtle
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Pursell
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter

Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Sanders
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Williams
Wolf
Wyllie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—20

Baker
Chandler
Collins (IL)
Dannemeyer
Davis
Dooley
Dymally

Ireland
Lipinski
Livingston
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Packard
Quillen

Rogula
Russo
Sundquist
Thomas (GA)
Whitten
Yates

□ 1927

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Chandler against, Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So section 3 of House Concurrent Resolution 287 was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on House Concurrent Resolution 287, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRUMBLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H. CON. RES. 287, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Concurrent Resolution 287, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify for the RECORD regarding a vote I cast regarding House deliberations on House Concurrent Resolution 247, the fiscal year 1993 budget resolution. On rollcall vote No. 41, I inadvertently voted "yea," when my intention was to vote "nay."

I thank you for the opportunity to correct this discrepancy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, because I was traveling to my district in California, I missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 41 and "yea" on rollcall No. 42.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, let the RECORD show that on the first of these two series in the division votes I inserted my card in the machine at the southeast corner of the Chamber and cast a vote, and it was not recorded. The vote I cast was "nay."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3400 AND H.R. 3869

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3400 and H.R. 3869.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 255

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 255.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of engaging the majority leader in a colloquy about the schedule next week, if the majority leader would be good enough to explain the schedule for the rest of the week and for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously, the business for today is finished. There will be no more votes for today. There will not be votes on tomorrow.

On Monday, March 9, the House will meet at noon, and there will not be legislative business.

On Tuesday, March 10, the House will meet at noon to consider one bill under suspension, but the recorded vote on the suspension will be postponed until Wednesday, March 11. That bill is S 2047, to establish a commission to commemorate the bicentennial of the establishment of the Democratic Party of the United States.

On Wednesday, March 11, the House will meet at 2 p.m. to consider H.R. 2212, regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, veto override, 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday, March 12, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 11 a.m. and will take up H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992, subject to a rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the majority leader that we, the Republican Party, being the benevolent party, will not object to your Democrat bill coming up on Tuesday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman. We would be happy to have our friends on the other side join in at least debating if not voting for that bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman.

On Thursday, March 12, there is a possibility we will bring up the budget Process Reform Act, and amendments have to be filed by Monday on that. But as I understand it, that is probably going to be open, subject to an open rule. Is that the majority leader's understanding?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, I have not had a chance to discuss that with the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I will try to get an answer to that to the gentleman as quickly as possible.

Mr. SOLOMON. The report handed out at a press conference by the ethics committee earlier had mentioned there

could be an ethics bill up on March 9, and that is not on the schedule. Is that a possibility?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, it will not be up on March 9, and as to when it will come up, we will have to be in contact with the minority leader and with the minority ranking member on the ethics committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. I do not think the gentleman alluded to the Friday schedule. Are there apt to be votes on Friday, does he know?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think there will need to be votes on Friday, but it is impossible at this point to know that for sure, and Members should be advised that there is a possibility that there could be votes on Friday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the letter out of the Ethics Committee clearly stated that the ethics matter would be dealt with during the week of March 9. Now, am I hearing now that that is subject to change, that that may not happen next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, I did not say it would not be dealt with next week. It will be dealt with next week, but I do not know on which day. We have to consult with the minority leader and the ranking member.

Mr. SOLOMON. I certainly thank the majority leader for enlightening the membership.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would just say to the gentleman further that we will be consulting with the minority about whether views will be filed and when they will be filed, and that will be a determinant of when the bill will come up.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3337, 1992 WHITE HOUSE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3337) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the White House, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not objecting, I rise solely to inform the balance of the House Members here and those who may be watching that the minority is in concurrence with request of the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the action that we are taking would strike the Senate amendment, namely, the amendment which calls for the redesign of the coins, and then take the bill to conference? Is that what we are doing?

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, the action of the House would have the effect in the House of striking the language that would cause the redesign of the coins?

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees and reserves the right to appoint additional conferees: Messrs. TORRES; HUBBARD; BARNARD; WYLIE; and MCCANDLESS.

There was no objection.

DEFINITION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes said by people outside the realm of politics that there is no fundamental difference between the two political parties, they all say the same things, believe the same things, and all we get is candidates who sound and look the same.

I think it is clear in some of these things that have happened here in the last couple of days that there are major differences between the two parties. I would submit to you that the Democrats have more and more defined themselves as the party of government, welfare, and taxes, and more and more it is becoming apparent that the Republican Party is the party of family, work, and opportunity, and that we divide very clearly along those lines when we get policy issues before us such as we have seen in the last couple of days as we have debated the budget.

It is very clear in the debates that took place in this Chamber today that the Democrats do believe that good things come when you spend more money, that good things come from bigger and bigger government; the more you expand the size of the Government, the better off you are, the more you give to people on welfare programs, the better off they are, and that we need lots more taxes in order to pay for those kinds of benefits.

The Republican Party, I think, has made it clear that what we believe is that strong families, supported by strong work and the opportunities to work and opportunities to invest in that work, are what produce the healthy economy, a healthy country, and a healthy society.

□ 1940

It has been very clearly demonstrated, as the Democrats have reacted in the last couple days to President Bush's statement that he made a mistake in 1990 when he signed into the budget a deal that raised taxes. Immediately the majority leader, the Speaker, and the prominent Democrats in this body came forward and blasted the President for reneging on the budget deal.

In fact, the majority leader in his speech on the budget here today talked about the fact that the President had reneged on the budget deal by saying that he made that mistake. The President made it quite clear that he thought it was a mistake to have raised taxes, because the President now sees the consequences of that decision.

But the Democrats are saying, well, that was a good decision. In fact the Speaker in his statement on this said that that decision to raise taxes in 1990 "was a wise decision at the time and a wise decision today."

I wonder how many of the American people believe it was a wise decision to

raise taxes. The President now understands it was not so wise. The Democrats do not, but then they are the party of taxes.

Now, the point here that should be made is that the Democrats are also not faithful to the budget deal. If it was in fact the President reneging on the budget deal in a vacuum, that would be one thing, but the Democrats are going to bring to us a bill next week to tear down the firewalls within the budget. In fact, the budget today anticipated they might well do that; so when they suggest that what they are doing is being faithful to the budget deal, that is not true. What they are being faithful to is the taxes that were in the budget deal, but as for the spending restraints that were in the budget deal, they were to back out of the spending restraints in the budget deal and keep only the taxes, and they criticize the President who wants to get rid of the taxes and keep the spending restraints.

I think that makes it very clear where the two parties are. The Democrats are the party of government, more and more government, more and more government spending. They are the party of welfare, more and more welfare spending, so therefore more and more government spending; more and more taxes in order to pay for that spending.

The Republican Party is for family, work, and opportunity. The only way you can get there is with lower taxes.

The President now recognizes that what happened in 1990, despite his best intention, was wrong, that we should not have raised taxes and had an adverse impact on the American people. We should not have raised taxes and impeded the ability of society to produce more, and we should not have raised taxes and impeded the ability of the society to produce more opportunities for more people. That is the difference between the two parties.

The President now recognizes it was a mistake to raise taxes. The Democrats still do not see that it was. They are always for greater and greater taxation of American workers and the American people.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, a sad mistake. I had signed up for 5 minutes, but it appears I have a 60-minute special order lurking out there for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive my 60 minutes, vacate it and have a 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO A WONDERFUL FATHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today is one of those days in life that makes a person think about their own mortality and how short life really is. My father lived to be almost 83 years of age, just a few days short of his 83d birthday. He ended a long and fruitful life. Today is the 100th anniversary of his birth. He was 8 years older than my mother, so this is the first time that one of my parents comes to my attention as having been born a full century ago in another time, the beginning of what was called then the gay nineties.

I never realized I would be serving in the Congress of the United States to reach an anniversary like this. I have got a picture here of my father. Of course, anybody who follows the proceedings, Mr. Speaker, cannot see something like this because our cameras are forbidden to move in for close-ups; but it is my dad as a young captain in World War I with the American Expeditionary Forces. He had three of what we now call Purple Hearts. Then they were called wound chevrons, two for poison gas, one for shrapnel in his face.

I am one of those people who can truly say with my intellect and from the bottom of my heart that Harry Joseph Dornan was the greatest man I ever knew.

I was impressed when my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DALE KILDEE, came to the well one day, I cannot even remember what the debate was about, but he spoke about his father, his father being a humble working American and his love for his fellow men, that he was a union organizer, and he said he saw his father go to church every day of his life, what in the Catholic Church is called a daily communicant, saw him say a rosary every night, and it brought tears to my eyes, because I watched my father go to church every day of his life. We used to tease him in his late seventies and early eighties that he was the oldest altar boy in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, because if he looked up at the altar and the priest was alone or was with only one altar boy, he would always walk up, go right into the sacristy and come out on the altar and serve.

He also was one of the most generous people I have ever known in my life. I watched him stay up at night, Mr. Speaker, writing checks to charities, and as an Irish son of someone born in Ireland, his father was 4 years of age when he came over with my father's grandfather, Patrick Dornan, with eight children. I actually found this gravestone in Newburgh, NY, with Pat-

rick Dornan and all of the children's names listed on it, and here was my grandfather, William Dornan, my dad's father, the youngest of the eight kids, 4 years of age, 1848. My grandfather, my father's father, married at 47, my dad at 37, so there is a whole generation I will skip in there.

But I remember my dad telling me about his youth, racing cars before World War I, building businesses after he came home at 26 years of age from World War I, giving up on his beloved Manhattan and New York City to take his family to California, racing down to the track at Beverly Hills High School in his seventies and racing and sometimes beating high school youngsters.

The example he set in business and as a father to me, to my brother, Don, my older brother, and my brother, Dick, is something we treasure.

I am again one of these fortunate people who can say that my mother, who died at the young age of 67, was the greatest woman I have ever met.

My heart breaks for youngsters around this country who have no parents or one parent or who spend their whole lives wondering why their parents never hugged them or never used those three simple little words, "I love you."

When my dad would write these charity checks, and I forgot to mention that these charities he selected were Indian missions, native American, first American missions in the South, and to black organizations, what then would have been Negro organizations. He did this selflessly, beyond what anybody would call normal tithing, and he always used to kid, when I asked him about it, he would say, "Oh, I'm making up for the sins of my youth."

Shortly before he died, about 2 or 3 weeks, this is in January 1975, I told him I was going to run for Congress again. I had made four false starts, and he said, "Bobby, boy, I think you will make it this time. I won't be around, but I will be perched on your shoulder."

He said, "I'll tell you something, son. Try as hard as you can, because it all seems like 3 weeks."

I said, "What seems like 3 weeks, Dad?"

He said, "My entire life."

He said, "I don't know if I will make my 83d birthday," he said, "but I had one life before World War I, one life between the wars, your mother was taken from me in God's wisdom and I have had another life since here in California."

And he said, "But it's 3 weeks, that's all. Some people don't get that. All my friends are dead. I'm the last of my gang."

He said, "I left the city I loved because it fell apart on me. I left the party I loved because it fell apart on me. I was raised by a Democrat who became a Republican in 1940, my mother

also," and he said, "You're going to be called to account for this. What grieves me about this world is that it is such a dangerous place to raise children."

He said, "I want to start an organization before I am finished called the Society for the Uplifting of American Youth."

I wrote it down. I said, "Dad, there is no acronym there. We'll have to get a better name so we get some kind of kooky initials in there."

And he said, "Well, until something better comes along."

That night he designed the stationery and gave it to me.

He said, "Raising a child in this country is so different than the 1890's, the 1920's, the 1930's, the 1940's, the 1950's."

He said, "It's a dangerous place. I shudder for my 15 grandchildren."

Now, three of those grandchildren, mine. Each of his sons had five children. They are old enough to have given me and my Sally eight grandkids.

He thought it was going to be a tough world for his 15 grandchildren. I shudder for my eight grandchildren, and I think the one issue, and I will close on this, Mr. Speaker, that Harry Joseph Dornan will be most upset about, having a son in the Congress of the United States, is that in this Chamber we talk about economics, that has been going on all day long. We talk about foreign affairs and defense. That has been going on all day, all week. It will go on all year, but we never really talk about traditional values and the destruction of the American family in this country.

□ 1950

Harry Joseph Dornan, born March 5, 1892, I thank God for giving you to me. What a lucky son.

TRIBUTE TO CYRENE BAKKE DEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Cyrene Bakke Dear, an outstanding lady, a retired Washington newspaper columnist and retired officer of a family communications company, who died at the age of 95 on March 1.

Newspapers across the Nation have noted the many accomplishments of Cyrene Dear and her death last Sunday.

One of the most impressive news accounts regarding the life of Cyrene Dear appeared in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post.

I quote the obituary from the Washington Post:

Cyrene Bakke Dear, 95, a retired Washington newspaper columnist and retired officer of a family communications company, died

of cardiac arrest March 1 at the Georgetown retirement home in Washington.

Before retiring in 1986, she had been a vice president of Dear Publications and Radio Inc., which included small newspapers in the South and Midwest. Her column, which had run in the family publications over the years as "D.C. Current" and "Washington Siren," included not only Washington commentary, but stories about her travels abroad.

She was a member of the Woman's National Democratic Club, the National Press Club and the American Society of Newspaper Editors. She had served as an elder of Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

Mrs. Dear, who had lived in Washington since 1960, was a native of North Dakota. She was a graduate of a state teachers' college in Greeley, Colo., and attended the University of Chicago. Before coming here, she had taught in a one-room school in Colorado, was executive director of the Colorado Tuberculosis League and headed the Council of Social Agencies in Jersey City, N.J.

Her husband, J. Albert Dear, died in 1959. Survivors include three sons, David, of Bethesda, and Ralph and Walt, both of Henderson, Ky.; 14 grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren.

It was my pleasure to visit with the many members of the Dear family this morning at Georgetown Presbyterian Church prior to the funeral.

I first met Cyrene Dear in 1974 at Henderson, KY, the third largest city in my congressional district where her sons Walt Dear and Ralph Dear live. Ever since meeting Cyrene Dear I have liked and admired her.

Cyrene Dear was an intelligent, progressive, and personable lady who had many admirers and friends.

Truly, during the 95 years of Cyrene Dear's life, she contributed much to make this country a better place in which to live.

My wife Carol and I extend to the many members of the Dear family our sympathy upon the death of Cyrene Bakke Dear.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT WITH RESPECT TO BOUNCED CHECKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that was a very touching remembrance of his father. I think that it made a real impression on most all of us. I hope that one day when I am gone, my son and my daughters will remember me as he remembers his father.

Mr. Speaker, I got some disturbing news today, and I think this is going to be disturbing to the people of this country who watch what goes on in this body.

We all heard about the bounced checks that have taken place over the past several years that were brought to light not too long ago. And the Ethics

Committee was charged with the responsibility of investigating this and bringing to light those Members who routinely bounced checks at the House bank.

Well, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct today issued a preliminary report. It sent a "Dear Colleague" around to all of us telling us what they were going to do. And it certainly did not meet my expectations and I am very confident it is not going to meet the expectations of the people of this country.

They want to know which Members were bouncing those checks on a routine basis.

Now, what the committee came up with was a definition of what a significant amount of check bouncing was and what that sufficient amount was defined to be was the amount of the Member's next paycheck to be deposited during the month.

So, if you bounced a check for less than, say, \$5,000 in the month, it was not a significant amount. Are not \$5,000, \$4,000, \$3,000 in a month significant amounts? I beg to differ. They are significant amounts.

And they further went on, and I will read right out of the "Dear Colleague" that they sent. They said:

The committee further determined that such significant overdrafts were repeated and routine when they occurred in at least 20 percent of the months that a Member had an account at the bank. Thus, if one had an account for the full 39-month period of this inquiry, one would have had to overdraw by the significant amount at least once in each of 8 months.

But if their overdraft during those 8 months was less than the amount they deposited each month out of their pay check, which is about \$5,000 or \$6,000, then it did not count.

So, a guy could have for 8 months out of that 39-month period have an overdraft of \$2,000 or \$3,000, and it would not count. So, a lot of people are not going to be made known to the public who routinely bounced checks. Now, people in this country who go to their bank and bounce checks of this amount on a routine basis are going to be in big, big trouble. But if you bounce checks at the House bank for an amount less than what your monthly paycheck would be, your net monthly paycheck would be, then there is not going to be any problem. I think that is terrible.

They said the committee would publicly disclose the names and the pertinent account information for those found to abuse their banking privileges. Well, there were a lot of people that do not qualify under this rule or this decision made by the Ethics Committee who ought to be brought to light. And the problem is this: The American people think very poorly of the Congress of the United States, they think very badly about everybody in this town right now, from the White

House all the way through the Congress. And for us to in any way cover this up will only diminish the way people look at us in the Congress. It has got to be brought to the attention of everybody in this body and to the attention of the people in this country. We have to make full disclosure, full disclosure. If somebody bounced a check of a small amount, then they can go back to their constituents and say, "I bounced a check for \$20," or \$30 or \$40. I believe the people of this country will understand that.

But if somebody bounced checks in the amount of \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, many times over a period of 39 months, then, by golly, they ought to be taken to task. And this does not cover that. Many of these people are going to get away with bloody murder, and it is going to bring discredit and disrepute on the House of Representatives, and that should not occur.

I would like to say to my friends on the Ethics Committee they ought to go back to the drawing boards and come back with a resolution that will make full disclosure, full disclosure. I do not want a black eye. I did not bounce any checks. But this is going to give us all a black eye because you will not know who bounced checks, because only a very small number of those who bounced checks are going to be made public. That is wrong.

As I said before, if it is a small check that was bounced, I think you can go back to your constituents and make a case that that was a mistake. But if it was a \$2,000 overdraw for 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 months, then I think you have got big problems.

□ 2000

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to bring the credibility of the House of Representatives back up to where it should be, if we are going to make the people of this country respect the Congress of the United States, then we cannot sweep this under the rug. We have got to make full disclosure, and I urge the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to do so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2 p.m., on account of official business.

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), on March 3, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INHOFE, for 5 minutes, on March 10 and 11.

Mr. EWING, for 5 minutes, on March 10 and 11.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUBBARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, for 30 minutes, on March 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. GREEN of New York.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. McEWEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PALLONE.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. ATKINS, in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. SOLARZ, in two instances.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. NOWAK.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. FASCELL, in two instances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. MARKEY, in three instances.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1992, at 12 noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose or evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 102d Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ANTONIO J. COLORADO, Resident Commissioner, Puerto Rico.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3016. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting notification that a major defense acquisition program has breached the unit cost by more than 15 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3017. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-165, "District of Columbia Uniform Commercial Code—Funds Transfers Act of 1992," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3018. A communication from the President of the United States, Transmitting a report on developments since his last report of July 9, 1991, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) (H. Doc. No. 102-199); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3019. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Joseph Gerard Sullivan, Virginia, to be Ambassador to Nicaragua, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 92-17, Drawdown From DOD Stocks for Counternarcotics Assistance for

Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3021. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3022. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the administration's status report on improvements to the FAA Airmen and Aircraft Registry System, pursuant to Public Law 100-690, section 7207(d) (102 Stat. 4428); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3023. A letter from the Department of Commerce, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international dolphin protection; jointly, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Foreign Affairs.

3024. A letter from the Competitiveness Policy Council, Chairman, transmitting the Council's analysis and recommendations on the overall competitiveness of the American economy, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 4803; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROE (for himself (by request), Mr. MINETA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to impose a 1-year moratorium on rate tariff filing requirements for motor common carriers of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HALL of Texas (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consult with State medical societies in revising the geographic adjustment factors used to determine the amount of payment for physicians' services under part B of the Medicare program, to require the Secretary to base geographic-cost-of-practice indices under the program upon the most recent available data, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. EVANS, Ms.

KAPTUR, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ROE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 4394. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require merchant mariners' documents for certain seamen; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLILEY:

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the application of Federal prohibitions relating to harassment and intimidation victims and witnesses of crimes to victims and witnesses of crimes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4396. A bill to provide expanded penalties for individuals convicted of crimes of violence in the District of Columbia or of distributing drugs in the vicinity of schools in the District of Columbia, to revise standards for bail and pretrial detention in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia and the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 4397. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to persons who have suffered economic injury directly attributable to the commission of a bank fraud offense; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 4398. A bill to remove outdated limitations on the acquisition or construction of branch buildings by Federal Reserve banks which are necessary for bank branch expansion if the acquisition or construction is approved by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of New York (for himself, Mr. MRAZEK, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 4399. A bill to prohibit all United States military and economic assistance for Turkey until the Turkish Government takes certain actions to resolve the Cyprus problem and complies with its obligations under international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MACHTEY, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 4400. A bill to provide the Administrator of the Small Business Administration continued authority to administer the Small Business Innovation Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DAVIS, Ms. LONG, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 4401. A bill to extend until January 1, 1999, the existing suspension of duty on Tamoxifen citrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 4402. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on methyl and ethyl parathion and on dimethoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4403. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on Levodopa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLEY (by request):

H.R. 4404. A bill to withdraw and reserve certain public lands and minerals within the

State of Colorado for military uses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 4405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provision which includes unemployment compensation in income subject to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PACKARD:

H.R. 4406. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to modify the Interstate Commerce Commission's regulatory responsibilities over the trucking industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4407. A bill entitled, "Employment and Economic Growth Act"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself and Mr. DAVIS):

H.R. 4408. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of a military department to consider the needs of retired members of the Armed Forces, their dependents, and reservists who are served by a military medical facility whenever the Secretaries consider whether to close the facility or reduce the level of services provided at the facility; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DAVIS):

H.R. 4409. A bill to reauthorize the national marine sanctuaries program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate a 10-percent domestic investment tax credit and to provide a credit for the purchase of domestic durable goods, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4411. A bill to establish a Buy-American Fund to encourage American consumers to purchase products bearing a "made in America" label, to create guidelines for the use of "made in America" labels, and to protect against the misuse of such labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. SANGMEISTER):

H.R. 4412. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, relating to fair use of copyrighted works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4413. A bill to require a 2-year moratorium on the burning of hazardous wastes in cement kilns, and to provide for a study by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.J. Res. 433. Joint resolution designating October 1992 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution placing numerical and funding limitations on certain employee positions in the House of Representatives and the Senate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the

environmental cleanup of military installations should be a priority use of savings resulting from reductions in defense spending so that such installations can be made available for civilian use in the future; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 390. Resolution to establish the Select Committee on Violence; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. HUGHES.
H.R. 78: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 394: Mr. GEREN of Texas.
H.R. 589: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 602: Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 722: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SAVAGE.
H.R. 723: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SAVAGE.
H.R. 793: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LUKE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HENRY.
H.R. 911: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZELIFF, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1063: Mr. DOOLEY and Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 1072: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.
H.R. 1073: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.
H.R. 1110: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1124: Mr. GORDON, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.
H.R. 1190: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 1322: Mr. MARLENEE.
H.R. 1430: Mr. OWENS of Utah.
H.R. 1771: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 1774: Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 2017: Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 2070: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ROE.
H.R. 2227: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.
H.R. 2248: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2288: Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 2333: Mr. DERRICK.
H.R. 2363: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 2410: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HOLLOWAY.
H.R. 2420: Mr. RITTER.
H.R. 2470: Mr. FIELDS.
H.R. 2678: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LEVINE of California.
H.R. 2766: Mr. FAWELL.
H.R. 2776: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Mr. RINALDO.
H.R. 2819: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PENNY, and Ms. LONG.
H.R. 2840: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SAVAGE.
H.R. 2890: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 2945: Mr. PETERSON of Florida and Mr. HOPKINS.

H.R. 3067: Mr. BROWN.
 H.R. 3071: Mr. BRUCE.
 H.R. 3145: Mr. PACKARD.
 H.R. 3164: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. McGRATH, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 3285: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.
 H.R. 3349: Mr. SUNDQUIST.
 H.R. 3360: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 3395: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3441: Mr. CHAPMAN.
 H.R. 3462: Mr. LENT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3493: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WALSH, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
 H.R. 3534: Mr. SCHEUER.
 H.R. 3536: Mr. SCHEUER.
 H.R. 3571: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. HORN.
 H.R. 3592: Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mr. Wilson.
 H.R. 3636: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 3654: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KYL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. STOKES.
 H.R. 3675: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 3677: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. RAVENEL.
 H.R. 3698: Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 3850: Mr. RITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.
 H.R. 3927: Mr. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 3956: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FROST, Mrs. UNSOLD, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3986: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ESPY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3989: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 3990: Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 4046: Mr. STARK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr.

JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROWLAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. PRICE.
 H.R. 4114: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 4131: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WELDON.
 H.R. 4144: Mr. SMITH of Iowa.
 H.R. 4149: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 4158: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. KOLBE.
 H.R. 4211: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LENT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KYL, and Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 4214: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.
 H.R. 4271: Mr. STARK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. SCHUMER.
 H.R. 4277: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 4278: Mr. NAGLE and Mr. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 4279: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WISE, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
 H.R. 4315: Mr. KYL, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 4344: Mr. APPLEGATE.
 H.J. Res. 81: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.J. Res. 272: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CARR, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. THOMAS of California.
 H.J. Res. 290: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
 H.J. Res. 336: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. STARK.
 H.J. Res. 351: Mr. BRYANT.
 H.J. Res. 354: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.J. Res. 367: Mr. DICKS and Mr. MILLER of Washington.
 H.J. Res. 371: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. YATES.
 H.J. Res. 378: Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 384: Mr. PAXON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.J. Res. 394: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. MINETA.

H.J. Res. 411: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.J. Res. 427: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LENT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LONG, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H. Con. Res. 279: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 376: Mr. WALSH, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. OXLEY.

H. Res. 377: Mr. GOSS.

H. Res. 387: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MACHTELY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KLUG, Ms. HORN, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 255: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 3400: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3869: Mr. ZELIFF.